THE

DOCTRINE

OF

Final Universal Salvation

EXAMINED AND SHEWN

TO BE

UNSCRIPTURAL:

IN

Answer to a Pamphlet

ENTITLED

Salvation for all Men

ILLUSTRATED AND VINDICATED

AS

A SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE.

By *WILLIAM GORDON*,
Pastor of the third Church in *Roxbury*.

BOSTON:
Printed and Sold by T. AND J. FLEET,
at the BIBLE and HEART in Cornhill, 1785.

BRITISH MUSEUM

The PREFACE.

THE author of the following ſheets doth not mean to detract from the merit of his worthy brethren, who have publiſhed on the ſame ſide of the queſtion. He had began before he knew the deſign of others; and upon obſerving that his own plan was different, purſued it, deſirous of contributing to the extinction of an ancient and generally exploded ſentiment; and of furniſhing an antidote againſt the ſeemingly *malignant poiſon of the* OLD SERPENT, *firſt inſtilled into the ears of our common mother* Eve, *when he gave the lie to God's threatening and ſaid unto the woman*——"*Ye ſhall* NOT SURELY DIE."

The mental taſtes of men are as various as their animal; and therefore a variety of publications may pleaſe a much greater number, and by that means do more univerſal ſervice, than any ſingle one however well executed.

The Friend of Truth will never regret, that he ſtands not alone *in ſupport of it. He rejoices, at ſeeing numbers coming in to the aid of a good cauſe. And the author of this performance*

hopes,

hopes, that ſhould that be attacked afreſh, there will not be wanting thoſe who ſhall offer themſelves willingly to the ſervice of the Lord in defence of it; and the more ſo, as he will probably be prevented by particular engagements of a different nature.

Syriac was the vulgar language of Judea in the days of our Saviour; but with regard to every book of the New Teſtament, the preſumption is in favour of its being written in Greek; and we muſt neceſſarily admit that the Evangeliſts were divinely influenced to give us the true ſenſe of our Lord's expreſſions in the Greek words they uſed, which vindicates the repreſentation made of them as though uttered by our Lord.

The pamphlet deſigned to be anſwered is anonymous; and, whatever may have been whiſpered in private circles, it hath never been properly announced to the public, who compiled or who prefaced it. And it ought to be remembered, that when gentlemen think it eligible to enter into the literary world incog, they are not entitled to ſpecial reſpect from any excellency of private character, but may be fairly treated as though they were wholly unknown.

2 JY 61

THE
Doctrine of Final Univerſal Salvation
EXAMINED,
And ſhewn to be unſcriptural.

INDIFFERENCE to religious ſentiments, thought to be of *divine revelation*, however haſtily pronounced a proof of candour, catholiciſm and good ſenſe, muſt, upon mature deliberation, appear little other than an affront to the wiſdom of that *Being*, who is ſuppoſed to have revealed them.

That the writer of the following ſheets pretends not to ſuch indifference, cannot be complained of by thoſe who are *endeavouring* to ſpread their own particular tenets, which, though not really novel, are new to the generality of the preſent generation.

When perſons reject doctrines upon the ſole plea of their being new, it is warrantable to convince them of their miſtake: but it is not the antiquity or novelty of doctrines, that ſhould incline us to receive or reject them—no—but their being, or not being, contained directly or indirectly in the ſacred writings. The appeal is to be made to *Moſes* and the *Prophets*, to the *Evangeliſts* and *Apoſtles*, for it is the Bible that contains the religion of *conſiſtent* Proteſtants, and not the writings of *Origen* or *Clement* of *Alexandria*, or any other *uninſpired* divine.

Should

Should it be aſſerted, that our Lord's words in *Matthew*, when he ſays, "there be eunuchs who have made themſelves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's ſake," are to be underſtood *literally*; and ſhould it be brought in proof, that the pious and learned *Origen* caſtrated himſelf, the argument would produce a ſneer rather than conviction.

Whoever conſults the firſt volume of the celebrated *Moſheim*'s Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, will learn from thence, that *Origen* and *Clement* were notorious, for introducing into the church, that "*pagan philoſophy* and *vain deceit*, (alluded to by Dr. *Hartley*, but with a different view) and for mingling them with chriſtianity, and ſo corrupting it."*

Clement of *Alexandria*, who was the præceptor of *Origen*, flouriſhed about the year 206, and lived till towards 220. "His exceſſive attachment to the reigning philoſophy led him into a variety of pernicious errors."† *Origen*, who died in the year 254, aged 69, enchanted by the charms of the *Platonic* philoſophy, ſet it up as the teſt of all religion, and imagined that the reaſons of each doctrine were to be found in that favourite philoſophy, and their *nature* and *extent* to be determined by it."‡

But to diſmiſs *Clement* and *Origen*, and attend to *Jeremiah White*, chaplain to *Oliver Cromwell*, who is honoured with the epithets of *pious*, *ingenious* and *excellent*. If theſe epithets are *deſigned* to bias the mind and prejudice the reader, in favour of the chaplain's reaſoning, it muſt be imputed to weakneſs or craft; but whether lay-craft or prieſt-craft is immaterial to the caſe in hand. That the chaplain was ingenious will appear from the following anecdote, which will alſo

* Salvation for all Men illuſtrated and vindicated, p. 21.
† Moſheim, Vol. I. p. 148.
‡ Moſheim, Vol. I. p. 221.

alſo prove at the ſame inſtant, that *Oliver Cromwell* was ſtill more ingenious. *Jerry* while in a ſtate of celibacy was ambitious of matrimonial connexions with his maſter's daughter, and laboured privately to gain her affections. *Oliver* obtained information of it, and, watching the opportunity, enters abruptly into the room where *Jerry* was upon his knees before his *Dulcinia*. The ſight of him in ſuch a poſture led *Cromwell* to aſk the reaſon of it. *Jerry* ingeniouſly anſwered, that he was beſeeching her ladyſhip to intercede on his behalf, that he might obtain one of her maids of honour (mentioning the name) in marriage. *O!* crys the more ingenious maſter, *is that all! Well! I will help you out of your difficulty;* and immediately ſummoned the unſuſpecting innocent maid into his preſence, enjoined her compliance with the wiſh of the chaplain, and then ſaw to it, that it was ſo and the parties married.

But if *Oliver's* Chaplain was ever ſo pious, ingenious and excellent, what is that to the purpoſe? No man is to receive the doctrine of *Univerſal Salvation* upon that account; any more than that *monſter of monſters* the doctrine of *tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe embraced taught and defended by many Papiſts far more pious, ingenious and excellent than ever was *Jeremiah White*.

We are told (p. 4) that Mr. *White's* introduction "breathes a ſpirit of piety and benevolence," it is not pretended however that this is an argument in favour of a *Univerſal Reſtoration of the human race*; and yet it may ſerve to *captivate ſilly women*, whether in petticoats or breeches, *who are ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth*; and to make them believe that he has the true knack of interpreting ſcripture.

The only anſwer, that Mr. *White's benevolent* rant and rhapſody upon the divine goodneſs is entitled to, are the following lines of Dr. *Young*.

"Not

" Not, *thus*, our infidels th' *Eternal* draw,
A God all-o'er, conſummate, abſolute,
Full orb'd, in his whole round of rays complete:
They ſet at odds heav'n's jarring attributes;
And, with one excellence, another wound;
Maim heav'n's perfection, break its equal beams,
Bid *mercy* triumph over—God himſelf,
Undeify'd by their opprobrious praiſe:
A God *all* mercy, is a God unjuſt."*

Having done with Mr. *White*'s introduction we ſhould now proceed to his ſcripture arguments, which we muſt ſuppoſe have not ſuffered by being printed in the preſent form; but it may be proper to lay down beforehand certain principles and rules, to be regarded, while we are interpreting the ſcriptures, and profeſs to venerate them as *divine oracles*.

The writers being inſpired by one and the ſame Spirit, no real contradiction of doctrine can be admitted; and each muſt be underſtood in a ſenſe that accords with the whole.

The meaning of particular paſſages is not to be determined by the *ſound* of words; but the ſound of words is to be determined by the *meaning* of ſuch paſſages, which muſt be fixed by the connexion, circumſtances, and agreement with other paſſages.

We muſt not uſe a violence in forcing particular ſenſes upon ſcripture expreſſions, when we ſhould *bluſh* to practiſe the ſame with human compoſitions.

Theſe maxims being admitted, let us paſs on to try Mr. *White*'s ſcripture arguments.

The firſt he produces is from the 1ſt epiſtle to *Timothy* ii. 3, 4. *God our Saviour, who will have all men to be ſaved, and come to the knowledge of the truth.* He tells us

* The Complaint, Night iv.

us that "the letter of this text is full and expreſs, *God will have* ALL MEN *to be ſaved*, and ſhould we preſs it, there are almoſt as many arguments as words;" but we may *preſs* it to death before we can extract one argument from it in favor of the *Univerſal Reſtoration of the human race.* ALL MEN are in capitals, as though ALL neceſſarily meant *every individual*; and as though it would be abſurd to underſtand the term with any limitation; whereas there are many univerſals in ſcripture uſe, that, if not underſtood with limitations, imply the greateſt falſehoods. It is truly ridiculous, to obſerve how ſome trifling geniuſes will furniſh themſelves with a ſet of *univerſals*, and, by jingling the ſame, pleaſe themſelves and amuſe their admirers.

Unhappily for the chaplain, he ſays, "the words are to be taken in the *ſame* latitude and extent with other places," and quotes ch. vi. 13. *God that quickneth all things.* Working upon it by his own example, *the letter is full and expreſs*, God that quickneth ALL THINGS; and yet ALL in this paſſage cannot be underſtood without a limitation; for ſtocks and ſtones and a number of other *inanimate* things God doth *not* quicken. We live in an age of wonders. Who knows, but what ſome wonderful interpreter, one of ten thouſand, may ariſe ſhortly, who ſhall attempt proving from this paſſage, together with the words of *John* the baptiſt—*God is able of theſe ſtones to raiſe up children to Abraham*—that the period will come when *univerſal animation ſhall prevail*, and the mountains ſhall ſkip with *real life* like rams, and the little hills like lambs.

Mr *White* or his tranſcriber has miſ-quoted when he ſays "our Saviour tells us, *all things live to God.* Luke 20. 38. for *things* is not expreſſed, and cannot

be

be implied in the *original*, as the tranſciber will know by conſulting the Greek, which it is apprehended he underſtandeth.

The original word and its compound, uſually tranſlated *all*, occur, in the maſculine, feminine and neuter genders, in the ſingular and plural numbers, not leſs than 1278 times.*

It is tranſlated variouſly by the terms—*every*—*whole*—*whoſoever*—*whatſoever*—*whomſoever*—*all manner of*—*and all*. When connected with a negative, it anſwers to *any*; but our tranſlators inſtead of *not any* render the terms *no*; thus *no* fleſh ſhould be ſaved (Mark 13. 20) *no* fleſh ſhall be juſtified (Rom. 3. 20.)

It often intends *every individual* without exception, and at other times ſignifies only *every kind*, or *a great* number, and that even when the number is *leſs* than half of the kind. It is uſed with like latitude that attends the term *all*, and when the *Engliſh* idiom will admit, is moſtly tranſlated by it.

What follows will evince, that it is by no means neceſſary to believe, that *every ſingle man and woman will be ſaved*; becauſe we read, "God will have ALL men to be ſaved!"

When we are told (Mat. 4. 23) that our Lord healed *every* (as it is in the original and is ſo rendered Mat. 9. 35) ſickneſs, and every diſeaſe, we cannot underſtand any thing beyond what our tranſlators have intimated by ſaying, *all manner of* ſickneſs and *all manner* of diſeaſe. (The ſame may be obſerved of Matt. 10. 1.) It would be abſurd to ſuppoſe that *all* (or even *half* of)

* Matt. 131. Mark 72. Luke 174. John 63. Acts 184. Rom. 71. 1 Cor. 111. 2 Cor. 52. Gal. 16. Eph. 53. Phil. 34. Coll. 40. 1 Theſſa. 18. 2 Theſſa. 16. 1 Tim. 24. 2 Tim. 18. Titus 14. Philm. 2. Heb. 51. James 13. 1 Pet. 18. 2 Pet. 7. 1 John 27. 2 John 2. 3 John 2. Jude 6. Rev. 59.

of) the ſick and *all* the diſeaſed of *all Galilee* ſhould be brought to him. When it is mentioned (in the next, the 24th verſe) that his fame went throughout *all Syria*, and they brought unto him *all* ſick people; nothing more could be deſigned than *great numbers*, and yet probably not a quarter of *all* the ſick through *Syria*, which was a large country. When our Lord told his apoſtles (Mat. 10. 22) that they ſhould be hated of *all* men, he neceſſarily excepted *all* that ſhould entertain them and hear their words. When he pronounces the muſtard ſeed (Mat. 13. 32) the leaſt of *all* ſeeds, could he mean any other than that it was a ſmall ſeed, one of the leaſt? as every one knows there are much ſmaller ſeeds. What a huge and ſtrong net muſt that be (mentioned in the 47th v.) which when caſt into the ſea, could gather of *every* kind; if by *every* (the ſame in the original with *all*) is intended every one whatſoever without exception! Our Lord charged his diſciples (Mat. 23. 3.) to obſerve *all whatſoever* the Scribes and Phariſees ſitting in *Moſes*'s ſeat bade them obſerve; but it was only *that all whatſoever*, which agreed with *Moſes* and the Prophets; for they taught many things from that ſeat, which were derogatory from the glory of God and oppoſite to his holy commands. "Had He enjoined an abſolute ſubmiſſion to their dictates, He would in effect have forbid their believing in himſelf, whom the ſcribes rejected." Every American is aware, that the expreſſion muſt be limited or that otherwiſe it is not true, that *all* they that take the ſword ſhall periſh with or by the ſword (Mat. 26. 52)

When *Simon* ſaid to our Lord (Mark 1. 37) *all* men ſeek for thee, did he include all the Sadducees, Scribes and Phariſees? Our Lord and the diſciples that attended him were Jews, ſome of them eat with unwaſhed hands; and yet we read, that the Phariſees and *all* the

Jews

Jews except they waſh their hands oft eat not (Mark 7. 3.) When our Lord ſaid, *all* things are poſſible to him that believeth (Mark 9. 23) were there not *numberleſs* exceptions ſuppoſed, though the words are *full* and *expreſs*? The like when he ſaid (Mark 11. 24) *what things ſo ever* ye deſire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them and ye ſhall have them: and again (Mark 13. 13.) ye ſhall be hated of *all* men for my names ſake: and again (ver. 23.) behold I have foretold you *all* things. Did *every individual* of the *Jewiſh* council conſent, though it is aſſerted that they *all* condemned him, i. e. Chriſt, to be guilty of death (Mark 14. 64) when we read (Luke 23, 51.) that the counſellor *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* had not conſented to the counſel and deed of them?

We are informed (Luke 3. 21) that *all the people* were baptized by *John*; but from *John*'s continuing to baptize long after this, it is evident, that *all* means only great numbers of *all* ranks and profeſſions among the Jews. Our Lord tells the Phariſees (Luke 16. 16.) that *every* man preſſed into the kingdom of God; and yet *they*, ſo far from doing it, hindered others all they could. When *Luke* ſays (19. 7.) that they *all* murmured at ſeeing our Lord going to be gueſt with *Zaccheus*, he could mean no more, than that there was a *general* murmur; for among the multitude there were many followers, who were ſo attached to Chriſt as to be ſatisfied with all he did. When the woman of *Samaria* cried out to the citizens "come ſee a man who told me *all things that ever* I did. Is not this the Chriſt?" (John 4. 29.) none of them were ſo fooliſh as to imagine, that ſhe included *every* tranſaction of her life. When our Lord, to encourage his apoſtles, promiſes the Comforter, and adds (John 14. 26) "He ſhall teach you *all* things," He did

not

not include *all* the arts and ſciences or other ſuperfluous knowledge; but all that was neceſſary for them to know.

What words can be more *full* and *expreſs* than the following, "there were dwelling at *Jeruſalem* Jews, devout men, out of *every nation under heaven* (Acts 2. 5.) It is not only *every nation*, but every nation *under heaven*; and yet there were *many* nations at that time *under heaven* that were not known to any one in *Jeruſalem*; though we ſhould admit that *America* was not then peopled, whereas the contrary is moſt probable. Every nation under heaven *where* the diſperſed Jews dwelt, is evidently all that is intended. The diſciples, we are informed, had *all* things common (Acts 2. 44) but he that would infer from thence, that it was ſo in *every* particular is not a fit member for either religious or civil ſociety, and would not be admitted to reſide long even among *Indians*, was he to attempt reducing his principles to practice. *Ananias* ſays to *Saul* (Acts 22. 15.) "thou ſhalt be his witneſs unto *all* men," though there were millions to whom *Paul* never preached, nor wrote, and to whom his very name was unknown.

The apoſtle *Paul* writes of himſelf (Rom. 7. 8) "Sin taking occaſion by the commandment wrought in me *all* concupiſcence;" the tranſlators have juſtly rendered it *all manner of* concupiſcence. Again (1 Cor. 6. 12) "*all* things are lawful unto me;" though none teſtified more ſtrongly againſt *all* things that were ſinful, and to his being under the law to Chriſt, and not without law to God. He was made *all* things to *all* men, that he might by all means ſave ſome; (1 Cor. 9. 22.) and yet was never a ſinful conformiſt to the manners and cuſtoms of the vicious, though rich, mighty and noble, and therefore muſt be underſtood accordingly: the ſame when he ſays "I pleaſe *all* men in *all* things (1 Cor. 10. 33.) for tho' in matters of pure indifference

no one was more condeſcending; and in *all* ſuch things he was pliable as a thread; yet, when truth and holineſs were concerned, he was firm as the rock and bold as the lion. Charity which believeth *all* things and hopeth *all* things (1 Cor. 13. 7.) cannot believe or hope *any thing* inconſiſtent herewith.

How unreaſonable, arbitrary and cruel would it be for a man to argue from his reading (Eph. 5. 24.) "let the wives be ſubject to their own huſbands in *every thing*," that his wife was patiently to ſubmit to *every* cruelty and to *every* command, that he is pleaſed to lay her under, when intoxicated with wine, with rage, or attachments to other women. As unreaſonable as to argue, that there were no diſintereſted chriſtians but *Timothy*, when the apoſtle wrote (Phil. 2. 21.) "for *all* ſeek their own things, not the things of Jeſus Chriſt."

In the firſt epiſtle to *Timothy* (6. 10.) the apoſtle tells us, "the love of money is the root of *all* evil;" and yet we know, that there is *much* evil that hath nothing to do with the love of money, and doth not grow upon that root. He ſays in his letter to Titus (2. 11.) that "the grace of God," viz. in the goſpel diſpenſation, "*hath appeared* to *all* men," which muſt be underſtood as intending *men of all* nations ranks and orders; for every individual man, even myriads, *had not* been made acquainted with the goſpel.

John tells us in the Revelation (5. 13.) "and *every* creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and ſuch as are in the ſea, and *all things* that are in them, heard I ſaying, Bleſſing and honour and glory and power be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb forever and ever." Will a perſon of any ſenſe ſuppoſe from hence, that every thing that was before mute became vocal; and not rather, that *all* nature in different ways concurr'd in this ſong of praiſe.

When

When we read, that *every* bond man and *every* freed man hid themſelves from the wrath of the Lamb (Rev. 6. 15, 16.) we muſt except *all* the friends of the Lamb. When the beaſt cauſeth *all* both ſmall and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads (Rev. 13. 16.) notwithſtanding the words are ſo *full* and *expreſs* we muſt exclude *every* one whoſe faithfulneſs and attachments to Chriſt would not admit of their complying. When Babylon becomes the hold of *every* foul ſpirit and a cage of *every* unclean and hateful bird (Rev. 18. 2.) we cannot ſuppoſe, that foul ſpirits, unclean and hateful birds are to be found in no other part of the univerſe than *Babylon*: nor can we underſtand the phraſe literally when it ſaid (verſe 24.) in her was found the blood of *all* that were ſlain upon the earth. When *all* the fowls are called upon to come and gather themſelves together unto the ſupper of the great God, that they might eat the fleſh of *all* men (Rev 19. 18.) both free and bond, both ſmall and great, the fleſh of the enemies of God is all that can be meant. And when the foundations of the wall of the heavenly *Jeruſalem* are ſaid to be garniſhed with *every* precious ſtone (Rev. 21. 19.) the ſenſe is no more than our tranſlators apprehended and have expreſſed by *all manner of* precious ſtones.

But as ſaith Dr. *Doddridge* "it would be endleſs to enumerate the texts, where common ſenſe requires us to take the word *all* in this general manner."

We may fairly conclude, from this induction of particulars, that we are not bound to admit, that *no one whatſoever*, let him be the moſt abandoned profligate that ever exiſted, will miſs of *final* ſalvation, becauſe the apoſtle has uſed the term ALL, and ſaid "God will have ALL men to be ſaved."

But

But ſhould we admit of Mr. *White*'s interpretation, that *all men* means the whole human race, not a ſingle ſoul excepted, yet his favourite doctrine could not be ſupported by this text. He tells us indeed, "it is not ſaid God *would* have all to be ſaved by his *good will*, but that he *authoritatively wills it*: *wills* it as a being of ſupreme, uncontrouſable power, a being that *will* be obeyed. It is a *fixed, determined, immutable* will, not *tranſient*, nor revocable. Thus *powerfully*, and *irreſiſtibly* does God *will all men to be ſaved.*" Boldly aſſerted! When a man is haranguing and has a point to carry, there is nothing like declaring roundly and with the utmoſt confidence, without diſcovering the leaſt change of countenance or trepidation of voice, *the ſtory is true, it is certainly ſo*, let it be ever ſo contrary to reaſon, ſcripture or facts; for he will find ſome, who will credit him upon it, even ſome who are ſenſible and judicious in other reſpects; but, through weakneſs of intellectual nerves, they ſuffer themſelves to be *ſtormed* out of their ſenſes, by the daring aſſaults of deſperadoes in religion.

However, not to be terrified by Mr. *White*'s bold aſſertions, let us try the truth of them; and their agreement with his next paragraph, wherein we read "as he, i. e. God, *wills* the end, ſo does he *will* the *neceſſary means leading* to it. In order to their being *ſaved*, he will have *all men* come to the knowledge of the truth. No man *is* or can be *ſanctified* or *ſaved* without the knowledge of the truth; God wills therefore that this means of ſalvation ſhall paſs upon them." But the chaplain or his tranſcriber has failed to tell us *where* this means of ſalvation—the knowledge of the truth—paſſeth upon all men.

That perſon is paſt reaſoning with, who will deny that the apoſtle by *truth* here means the goſpel. It

is

is indiſputable that not one half of the world is chriſtianized; and that, ſo continuing, it is morally impoſſible, they ſhould have the *knowledge of the truth.* But if the end is not to be obtained without the neceſſary means, and the neceſſary means, do not take place—if no man *is* or *can be* ſanctified or ſaved without the *knowledge* of the truth; and yet millions live and die, from age to age, without this knowledge, then it muſt follow, that the *will* of that Being, who is ſaid to will that ALL MEN come to the knowledge of the truth, cannot mean that *authoritative will*, which is accompanied with *uncontroulable* power and is *ever obeyed.* Seeing then that God doth as powerfully and irreſiſtably will all men *to come to the knowledge of the truth*, as *to be ſaved;* and that facts without number evidence, that all men come *not* to the knowledge of the truth, we are reduced, by dire neceſſity, to underſtand the divine will in the text for the *approving* and not the determining and effecting will of God.

The apoſtle makes no difference between God's willing that all ſhould be ſaved, and his willing that all ſhould come to the knowledge of the truth. Let it alſo be noted, that the original is *not*, who wills *to ſave* all men, but wills all men *to be ſaved*, the verb is paſſive and not active. Had it been active, Mr. *White*'s firſt text in proof of the *certain ſalvation of all men* would have been far more to the purpoſe; as it is, he obtains no ſupport from it. Our tranſlators were ſenſible of a material difference, between God's willing *to ſave* all men and willing all men *to be ſaved*; and have hinted this difference by rendering the paſſage *will have* all men *to be ſaved.* They would have expreſſed the meaning of the apoſtle yet more fully, had they rendered it *would have* all men to be ſaved, intending, by

his

his *good will*: for, notwithſtanding, what the chaplain *authoritatively* pronounces, the apoſtle, while he uſes the original word for *will*, in the ſame tenſe and mood, not leſs than thirty-nine times in his writings, in more than twenty nine places alludes to the *inclination* of the mind and not the *operating power* of the will; accordingly it is tranſlated in twenty four* inſtances by *would*, in one by *diſpoſed*,† in a ſecond by *I had rather*,‡ and in three others by *deſire*.§ In the other ten places,‖ where it is rendered *will* and *wilt*, it might be once and again more properly *would* or *wouldſt*. It occurs only twice in the remaining epiſtles. *James* ſays (2 ch. 20) but *wilt* thou know O vain man, which is tantamount to—but *know* thou O vain man. John writes (3 ep. 13 v.) I *will* not.

We meet with it, in the hiſtorical books of the new teſtament, ſixty one times, fifty one of which it is tranſlated *will* or *wilt*: the fifty one muſt be reduced to forty one, for in ten places of *Mark* and *Luke*,†† we have only a repetition of what we meet with in ſix of *Matthew*.‡‡ In twelve more,‖‖ at leaſt, out of the forty one, the alluſion is evidently to the *inclination*, *pleaſure* or *deſire* of the perſon or perſons concerned.

The

* Rom. 1. 13.—7. 15, 16, 19, 20. twice in the 19th ver.—11. 25.—16. 19.—1 Cor. 7. 7, 32.—10. 1, 20.—11. 3. 12. 1.—14. 5. 2 Cor. 1, 8.—5. 4.—12. 20. twice. Gal. 3. 2.—4. 17. Col. 2. 1. 1 Theſſ. 4. 13. 2 Theſſ. 3. 10.

† 1 Cor. 10. 27. ‡ 1 Cor, 14. 19.

§ Gal. 4. 9,——6. 12, 13.

‖ Rom. 9. 18. twice.—13. 3. 1 Cor. 4. 21.—7. 36, 39. 14, 35.—16. 7. 1 Tim. 2. 4.—5. 11.

†† Mark 1. 41.—8. 34.—10. 51.—14. 12, 36.—15. 9, Luke 5. 13.—9. 23.—18. 41.—22. 9.

‡‡ Matt. 8. 3.—16. 24.—20. 32.—26. 17, 39.—27. 17.

‖‖ Matt. 13. 28.—15. 28.—17. 4.—20. 21.—27. 21. Mark 6. 25.—15. 12. Luke 19. 14. John 5. 6.

* Acts 7. 28.—9. 6.—25. 9.

The remaining number is twenty nine;* and ſhould the impartial reader conſult them, he will probably be ready to judge that in ſeveral of them no more is meant than the *inclination*.

As to the other ten of the ſixty one, the original is tranſlated would or wouldſt,† deſire or deſireth,‡ and liſteth.‖ Thus it appeareth, that not only in *Paul*'s writings, but through the whole new teſtament, the original word, in the ſame tenſe and mood, rendered *will* in the text under conſideration, alludes to the *inclination* of the mind, and not to that *operating power* of the will for which the chaplain contendeth.

It may be objected, that however the original word alludes in common to the *inclination* of the mind, as hath been now obſerved, becauſe that it is the *will* of the *creature* that is concerned; yet that when the *divine Being* ſpeaks or is ſpoken of, it hath another meaning: for, that as Mr. *White* ſaith (p. 6.) "the *will* of God does not reſt in pitying men, and wiſhing it were better with them—no—the *will* of God and his *work* are one. He *wills* nothing but he *works* it." That "He is an *omnipotent* and *wiſe* agent and can never be reſiſted," ſo as to be fruſtrated even when oppoſed, is readily granted: but that, when he is ſaid to *will* in the ſacred writings, we are not always to underſtand *ſuch kind* of *will* as the chaplain maintains, hath been ſhewn from *the fact*, that all men do *not come to the knowledge of the truth*, though he is ſaid to *will* that they ſhould do it;

* Matt. 9. 13.—11. 14—12. 7—15. 32.—19. 17, 21. —20. 14, 15.—21. 29.—23. 4.—26. 15.—27. 43. Luke 9. 54.—12. 49.—13. 31. John 5. 21, 40—6. 67.—8. 44.—9. 27.—17. 24.—21. 22, 23. beſides the ſix above ſpecified at the mark ‡‡.

† Matt. 12. 38. Mark 10. 35, 36. Luke 6. 31. John 9. 27.—12. 21.—21. 18.

‡ Mark 9. 35. Luke 5. 39. ‖ John 3. 8.

it; and will be made further to appear, when it ſhall have been proved below, that all men *are not ſaved*, for that individuals do really periſh. However before we enter upon that proof, let me point out the error of Mr. *White*'s aſſertions from other paſſages of ſcripture, which contain a flat denial of them.

Our Saviour, to ſilence the cavils of the phariſees at his eating with publicans and ſinners, tells them to go and learn what that meaneth I *will have mercy and not ſacrifice*. (Matt 9. 13.) And when they complained to him, that his diſciples did what was not lawful to do upon the ſabbath, he anſwers them by ſaying, "if ye had known what this meaneth, *I will have mercy and not ſacrifice*, ye would not have condemned the guiltleſs (Matt. 12, 7.) The words are a quotation from *Hoſea* (6. 6) There *Jehovah* ſaith by the prophet, "for I *deſir'd* mercy and not ſacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." Dr. *Doddridge* renders the *Greek* in *Matthew*, "I *require* mercy and not ſacrifice;" and then notes, "ſo the *Greek* evidently ſignifies, when it expreſſes the will of a ſuperior; and this the original *Hebrew* word imports, which ſeems to anſwer to that modern phraſe uſed by princes *ſuch is our pleaſure*." The Septuagint tranſlation varies ſomewhat from our Saviour's quotation, which is as the *Hebrew* "mercy and not ſacrifice," whereas the other is mercy *rather than* or *before* ſacrifice, and the knowledge of God *rather than* or *before* burnt-offerings." The Septuagint obſerving, that the ſubſequent clauſe in the *Hebrew* determined the ſenſe of the preceding, rendered both in the ſame manner. The *verb* uſed by our Saviour and the Septuagint is the ſame: and his authority juſtifies the uſe of it as anſwering to the *Hebrew* original; and the meaning of the paſſage in *Hoſea* proves, that in the

new

new teſtament it intendeth *I deſire, prefer, take delight in, am pleaſed with, require*, and the like, whatever the chaplain or his tranſcriber may aſſert to the contrary.

One of the greateſt *Hebricians* that this century hath produced, *Schultens*, makes *to bend* the primary notion of the *Hebrew* root in *Hoſea;* from whence the tranſition is eaſy to the ſubſequent ſecondary ſignifications—" to have a ready, well-diſpoſed, and cheerful inclination of will and affection; to be well affected to; to favour; to delight in; to be willing; to chooſe;" which are given as the common meaning of the word by Dr. *Taylor* in his *Hebrew* Concordance. He hath omitted mentioning *to will*, but cannot be thought to mean, that it ſhould be excluded; ſeeing, that the *very firſt tranſlation* he gives, is in the *Latin* for *to will;* and in this he agrees with *Pagninus, Buxtorf, Leigh, Opitius, Stock*, and others, who had before interpreted the *Hebrew* root in the like manner that he hath done.

The Doctor in his preface remarks to the following purport, " The words and phraſes of the new teſtament are but the words and phraſes of the old tranſlated into *Greek*. The ſame language runs through the whole, and is ſet in ſuch a variety of lights, that one part is well adapted to illuſtrate another. To underſtand the meaning of the Spirit in the new, it is eſſentially neceſſary that we underſtand its ſenſe in the old teſtament. By carefully collating thoſe places of the ſacred code where any word is uſed, you may judge what ſenſe it will, or will not bear. Which being once ſettled, there lies no appeal to any other writings in the world; becauſe there are no other books in all the world, in the pure original *Hebrew*, but the books of the old teſtament. A judgment therefore duly formed upon them muſt be abſolutely deciſive."

Let us proceed upon this plan, and attend to the iſſue. The *Hebrew* verb, the ſenſe of which hath been given, is to be met with eighty four times in the old teſtament, thirty nine of which it is aſſerted of or uttered by, the divine Being. In ſixteen out of theſe it is rendered *delight, have delight, delighted, delighteth,** *favoureſt,*† *well pleaſed,*‡ *and have no pleaſure,*§ the negative being added; and that the true ſenſe could not have been given, but in theſe or words of ſimilar meaning, is evident from the prepoſitions with which the verb is connected in the original. In the other twenty three places it is rendered *pleaſed, pleaſe, hath pleaſure in,* and *have I any pleaſure at all;*** *would* and *will;*†† *delighteth in* and *delight;*‡‡ *deſire, deſired* and *deſireſt* ||||

In the forty five places, where the *Hebrew* verb has a reference to the creature, it is tranſlated in like manner as when referring to the divine Being, except in *Job* 40. 17: in which it is *moveth.* It is only *will* in *Ruth* 3. 13: *would* in 1 *Kings* 13. 33: and *willing* in 1 *Chro.* 28. 9.

The Septuagint have tranſlated the *Hebrew,* in forty out of the eighty four places, by the *Greek* verb tranſlated *will* in 1 Tim. 2. 4; and in twenty of them, where the

* Numb. 14. 8. 2 Sam. 15. 26.—22. 20. 1 Kings 10. 9. 2 Chro. 9. 8. Pſ. 18. 19.—22. 8.—147. 10. Iſ. 62. 4. —65. 12.—66. 4. Jer. 9. 24.

† Pſ. 41. 11.

‡ Iſ. 42. 21.

§ Ezek. 18. 32.—33. 11.

** Judges 13. 23. Pſ 51. 19.—115. 3.—135. 6. Iſ. 53. 10. 55. 11.—56. 4. Jonah 1. 14. Pſ. 5. 4.—35. 27. Ezek. 18. 23. twice, more literally *in deſiring do I deſire,* but more elegantly *have I any pleaſure at all.*

†† 1 Sam 2. 25. Job. 9. 3. Pro. 21. 1.

‡‡ Pſ. 37. 23. Micah 7. 18. Mal. 2. 17. Iſ. 1. 11.

|||| Pſ 40. 6. Hoſea 6. 6. Pſ. 51. 6, 16.

the divine Being is ſpoken of or ſpeaks.* The introduction of the verb *will* into theſe ſeveral paſſages, inſtead of what our tranſlators have uſed, by ſuch as pleaſe to make the experiment, muſt ſufficiently ſhew the weakneſs of the chaplain, in laying that mighty ſtreſs upon it, and crying out "the *will* of God and his *work* are one. He *wills* nothing, but he *works* it." The generality of readers will probably be ſatisfied with the following ſpecimens.

David predicts the language, with which the enemies of our Saviour reproached him when upon the croſs, ſaying "he truſted in the Lord, that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, ſeeing he *delighted* in him."† The Septuagint render it in the preſent tenſe, ſo that the word is *exactly the ſame* as in *Timothy*; and, what deſerves obſervation, the *very ſame* with what the ſacred hiſtorian records.‡ Let the *Engliſh* then be, "let him deliver him ſeeing he *wills* him." Add Mr. *White*'s paraphraſe on the ſame word in *Timothy*, only changing *it* for *him*, and read, "He, i. e. God, *authoratatively wills* him; wills him, as a Being of *ſupreme, uncontroulable power*. It is a *fixed, determined, immutable* will, not *tranſient* and *revocable*. The *will* of God and his *work* are one. He *wills* nothing, but he *works* it." What a ſweet ſenſe this makes of the paſſage! Our tranſlators have avoided the abſurdity by rendering it in the Evangeliſt, "let him deliver him now, if he *will have* him," meaning *will approve* of him, or, to comport with the Pſalm, *delighteth in* him, which muſt be the ſenſe, becauſe of the prepoſition that the *Hebrew* verb is there connected with, though it is wanting both in the Septuagint tranſlation and in *Matthew*. The

* 2 Sam. 15. 26. 1 Kings 10. 9. 2 Chro. 9. 8. Pſ. 5. 4. —18, 19.—22. 8.—37. 23.—40. 6.—41. 11,—51. 16.—115, 3.—135. 6.—147. 10. Prov. 21. 1. Iſ. 55. 11.—56. 4. Ezek. 18. 23. twice, and v. 32. Hoſ. 6. 6.

† Pſ. 22. 8. ‡ Matt. 27. 43.

The prophet *Ezekiel* furniſhes us with the following remarkable paſſages. "Have I any pleaſure at all that the wicked ſhould die; ſaith the Lord God: and not that he ſhould return from his ways and live? For I have no pleaſure in him that dieth, ſaith the Lord."* The Septuagint tranſlation reads in *Engliſh* with the *Greek* verb rendered as in *Timothy*, "ſhall I *will* with my *will* the death of the wicked, ſo much as, (or, equally with) his turning from the evil way and his living? For I *will* not the death of him that dieth, ſaith the Lord." The uſe of the *Greek* verb ſignifying *to will* by the Septuagint, muſt be allowed to be juſt, from what hath been already obſerved.

Here it is evidently maintained, that the Lord *willeth* the amendment of the wicked rather than his death: And if ſo, it may be propoſed to Mr. *White*'s tranſcriber, how comes it about, that as God wills *authoritatively*, with *ſupreme uncontroulable* power, with a *fixed, determined immutable* will—how comes it about that as his *will* and *work* is one; and as he *wills* nothing, but he *works* it; that the wicked doth not turn from his evil way and live? What hinders? He is an *omnipotent* and *wiſe* agent, he can never be *effectually* reſiſted. The text and context, ſuppoſeth, that in divers inſtances the wicked dieth; and yet the wording of the text ſhews, that it is true of *every* wicked man that the Lord *willeth* his amendment rather than his death. It matters not to the argument what *this* death is, whether it intends future puniſhments or dying by national judgments. There is no other way of removing the abſurdities following upon Mr. *White*'s mode of reaſoning, but by admitting in oppoſition to what he pretendeth, that when the *will* of God is ſpoken of, it often means his benevolence or

good

* Ezek. 18. 23, 32.

good will; his *approving*, and not his *determining*, *effecting*, *omnipotent* will. The divine Being exerciſeth a *moral* government over his rational creatures. They have all a law written upon their hearts; to ſome he hath given a fuller and clearer revelation of his mind. By that He tells us, what we are to do, and what we are to forbear. When we go contrary to his directions we act wickedly; when we obey them we act righteouſly. It is his *will* and *pleaſure* that we ſhould act righteouſly. He threatens us, if we do not: He promiſes us benefits, if we do. His ſacred oracles are written in the language and dialect of theſe lower regions; and not, to us, in the *unintelligible* dialect of the upper; being deſigned for *mortals*, and not for angels. They ſpeak after the *manner of men*, who cannot ſpeak or conceive of the divine Being above human abilities; and therefore, to excite ſuitable thoughts and affections in them, diſtinctions are uſed concerning the Deity, and paſſions aſcribed to him, which do not really belong to his nature, and which, to prevent miſtakes, we are taught in other places are foreign to it, as implying changeableneſs and imperfection. Were we to conſider more, when reading the ſcriptures, the divine Being as the moral Governor of the world, publiſhing his *will* and *pleaſure* to his reaſonable creatures, we ſhould the more eaſily comprehend their meaning and deſign. It is the *will* and *pleaſure* of every kind ſovereign on earth, that all his people may be good ſubjects, and reap the benefit of it: and it is the *will* and *pleaſure* of the King of kings, that all his reaſonable creatures ſhould be faithful and obedient ſubjects, and of conſequence enjoy ſalvation.

It is not improbable, that when *Paul* wrote to *Timothy*, "who will have all men to be ſaved," he had his eye to thoſe gracious and encouraging declarations contained

tained in Ezekiel (ch. 18. 23, 32. and ch. 33. 11.) for his expreſſion is conformable thereunto: and that this is not a ſingular conjecture, is plain from the reference made to this paſſage of *Paul*'s, in the margin of ſome of our *Engliſh* bibles.

The goſpel conſiders all men as ſinners, and is, in ſhort, a PROCLAMATION from the King of kings, promiſing pardon and grace to all who repent and believe on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. It is the divine pleaſure, that this PROCLAMATION ſhould be publiſhed far and wide, through this globe, to all nations, kindreds, tongues and people; and that every one who hears it, ſhould take the benefit of it: and this is the ſenſe, in which "God *will* have all men to be ſaved, and come to the knowledge of the truth;" and let it be remembered, that it cannot be ſaid with juſtice, "of this will of his that it *reſteth* in pitying men, and wiſhing it were better with them;" for, by his Son, He commanded the apoſtles to go into all the world, and to preach the goſpel to every *human* creature,† without exception; and *Paul* was called to proclaim the glad tidings to the *Gentiles* expreſsly: and had chriſtian ſovereigns underſtood the calls of providence and of the ſcriptures, inſtead of having employed the fine arts of navigation to the infamous purpoſes of diſcovering new countries for to plunder and enſlave the natives, they would have employed them in the glorious purpoſe of ſpreading the divine Proclamation of pardon and grace through Jeſus Chriſt, to the everlaſting ſalvation of all true penitents and believers, without regard to their complexion, features, manners or cuſtoms.

Some may with me prefer the above explanation of Mr. *White*'s firſt text; while others chooſe to anſwer him by urging, that the words *all* men, do not neceſſarily imply any more than *all orders* and *ſorts* of men: for

† Mark 16. 15.

for that the term *all*, both before and after, *muſt* be underſtood in a limited ſenſe. When the apoſtle directs in the firſt verſe, that prayer ſhould be made for *all* men, he could not mean for *every individual*, as chriſtians were virtually prohibited by that *loving* diſciple *John* (1 John 5. 16.) praying for thoſe who had ſinned the ſin unto death, i. e, had been guilty of the unpardonable ſin againſt the holy Ghoſt. Again, when (in v. 8th) he writes, "I will therefore that men pray *every* where," he deſigns not in *each*, but in *any* place, without regarding its having been, or continuing to be, *holy* or *unholy*, which agrees with what our Lord taught the woman of *Samaria* (John 4. 21—24) in anſwer to her enquiry about the proper place of worſhip. Now if *all* in the 1ſt and in the 8th verſe *muſt* have a *confined meaning*, why may it not have the like ſenſe in the intermediate ſpace?

One or other of theſe interpretations muſt be allowed, or the ſcriptures are at variance, and give an uncertain ſound.

Now is the place, reſerved in my own intention for replying to an anſwer that may be given to the argument, drawn from all men's *not coming* to the knowledge of the truth, in proof that all men are *not ſaved*.

It may be anſwered, that though millions live and die without the knowledge of the truth, yet this means of ſalvation may paſs upon them *in another world*.

The pamphlet doth not aſſert it, in ſo many words; but the ſenſible and careful reader will obſerve, that *only ſome* principles are *publiſhed*, that others are concealed in *conſequences* to be revealed when the favourable opportunity offers. We may reſt aſſured, that we are not maſters of the whole plan, while we ſtop ſhort of *Origen*'s *full* ſentiment, who is pronounced by ſome to have "turned even hell itſelf into a *purgatory*; and to

have

have thought, that not only wicked men, but the very *devils* might be ſo purged in it, as to come forth *angels of light.*"*

That the knowledge of the truth is attainable in the dark regions of hell, will not appear incredible to thoſe who believe, that a free intercourſe is maintained between the miſerable inhabitants of it——that many who have propheſied in the name of the Lord Jeſus, and in his name have caſt out devils, and in his name done many wonderful works will be publickly doomed in the day of judgment to future puniſhments—and that numbers are called to the knowledge of the truth, who periſh notwithſtanding——it will be well, if there are no additions made to them, by the flattering and falſe hopes, that ſome entertain of being at length for ever happy, in a diſtant though unknown period, let their moral character here be what it may, from the unſcriptural perſuaſion, that there is actual ſalvation for all men. But though it ſhould be admitted, that the knowledge of the truth is attainable by all the damned in hell, whether men or devils; yet there is not the leaſt foundation in the ſacred oracles, for ſuppoſing that ſuch knowledge will prove *ſaving* to any of them. It is evident, that the New Teſtament confines the Proclamation of pardon and grace for all who repent and believe on Jeſus, to the inhabitants of our world; and hence they are aſſured, that if they believe not, they ſhall *not ſee life*, but the wrath of God *abideth* on them.† This is the current doctrine of ſcripture, ſo plain and intelligible, that he who runs may read it, and that the way-faring man though a fool cannot miſtake it—unleſs he is a *will*-fool. It is addreſſed directly to *ſinners* on earth, and not to *ſufferers* in hell; there is not the leaſt intimation, that it will ever be directed to the

* Wake's Diſcourſe on Purgatory, p. 3.

† John 3. 36.

the latter: the contrary is ſtrongly aſſerted; for the former are told, that if they believe not they ſhall *not ſee* life, but the wrath of God *abideth* on them. Will the wrath of God *abide* on them? Shall they *not ſee* life? They then that will venture to contradict this doctrine, and to teach men that the wrath of God will abide on them only for a certain period, and that after ſuch period they ſhall *ſee life*, though they have *trodden under foot the Son God, and have accounted the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and have done deſpite to the Spirit of grace*—ſuch teachers, methinks, ought to come inveſted with powers for working miracles *greater* than thoſe wrought by Jeſus and his apoſtles, for theſe verily taught the reverſe. The poet *Milton* gives a far more ſcriptural account of hell than ſuch teachers, when he crys out,

" Regions of ſorrow! doleful ſhades! where peace
" And reſt can never dwell! hope never comes,
" That comes to all: but torture without end
" Still urges, and a fiery deluge, fed
" With ever-burning ſulphur unconſum'd!"

We may be told, that *Peter* writes,† " Chriſt alſo hath once ſuffered for ſins, the juſt for the unjuſt, being put to death in the fleſh, but quickned by the Spirit, by which alſo he went and *preached* unto the ſpirits in priſon: which ſometime were diſobedient, when once the long ſuffering of God waited in the days of *Noah* while the ark was preparing." This paſſage has been greatly perplexed and tortured by deſigning and intereſted theoriſts, whoſe buſineſs it was to ſupport a favourite ſcheme. Dr. *Doddridge*'s tranſlation is certainly a juſt one—" Quickened by the Spirit, by which (or whom) *going forth* he preached to the ſpirits in priſon, who were *long ſince* diſobedient."— The Spirit by whom our Lord was quickened was the Spirit of God; this

† 1 Pet. 3. 18—20.

Spirit was granted to *Noah*, that preacher of righteouſneſs, by our Lord, who is therefore ſpoken of as *going forth* by him and *preaching* to thoſe ſpirits in priſon, who were long ſince, or formerly diſobedient, when once the long ſuffering of God waited in the days of *Noah*.

Whether this interpretation be allowed or rejected, matters not to the caſe in hand. Let perſons maintain, if they will, that the paſſage refers to our Lord's deſcent into hell or limbus patrum, and to his preaching there; it doth not appear from it, that his preaching proved effectual for the ſalvation of *any*; for *Peter*, at writing, ſpeaks of the auditors as being ſtill *ſpirits in priſon*, and makes no mention of any's returning with our Lord to a better place. His ſaying, who were *long ſince* or *formerly* diſobedient, doth not argue that they were not *now* diſobedient; for if they were not *now* diſobedient, they would ſcarce be ſhut up in priſon: but he alludes to that particular diſobedience in the day of their trial, when once the long ſuffering of God waited to ſee, what would be the effect of *Noah*'s preaching; and which diſobedience proved the occaſion of their being caſt into priſon.

Paul was a moſt zealous indefatigable preacher; and it is not to be doubted, but that he would readily have poſtponed going to heaven, on quitting the body, and have viſited the damned in hell, had there been the leaſt glimmering hope that he ſhould be inſtrumental in ſaving a *ſingle* ſoul out of that place of torments; whereas whenever he mentions being abſent from the body, he concludes that he ſhall be preſent with the Lord. It is now above four thouſand years ſince the diſobedient in the days of *Noah* were ſent to the priſon of hell; and we have not yet had *certain authentic* intelligence of *any one's* having been brought, by means of his torments, to godly repentance, and commenced an holy perſon, and in conſequence of ſuch change obtained a removal to glory.

The

The Papiſts indeed aſſure us, upon their word and honour, that numbers have gone to heaven from the limbus patrum and from purgatory; and in Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s time moſt of their divines taught, *that the damned and the ſouls in purgatory, are tormented in the ſame fire, and in the ſame place*: but they diſtinguiſh between the *damned* and the *ſouls in purgatory*; the latter are "penitent ſinners, who departed this life in grace and charity, but nevertheleſs indebted to the divine juſtice ſome *pains*, which they ſuffer in the other life; pardoned as to the eternal *guilt* or *pain*, yet obnoxious to ſome *temporal penalty*;" the *damned* are thoſe abandoned wicked graceleſs ſpirits, whoſe ſins ſhall *never be remitted*; ſo that in this point the Papiſts keep nearer to the ſcriptures than the *ingenious* Mr. *White* and his admirers.

Let us now proceed to the arguments in proof of there being *ſuch* damned, whoſe ſins ſhall *never be remitted*, and who will never *ſee* and enjoy *eternal life*; but ſhall have the *wrath* of God *abiding* on them.

The ſcriptures uniformly teach, that the moral characters of mankind are formed and fixed *in* and *by* the *preſent life*; that their ſtates are *unalterably* determined at death; and that the *time of probation* is then at an end. The admonitions, promiſes, threatnings and repreſentations of our Lord and his apoſtles evidently imply it.

Solomon's advice is—"whatſoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wiſdom in the grave, whither thou goeſt;"* by which he means to declare, that the preſent world is the ſtage whereupon we are called to perform the parts aſſigned us by our Creator; and that we ſhall not be allowed to perform them over again, in that inviſible world to which we are going. A greater

* Eccl. 9. 10.

greater than *Solomon* expreſſes the ſame ſentiment, when he ſaith, "I muſt work the works of him that ſent me, while it is *day*; the *night* cometh when no man can work."* The laſt clauſe appears to be a general acknowledged truth applied to his own particular caſe——a truth holding forth this inſtruction, that the *day of life* is the time of action; that the *night of death* cloſes the ſcene; and that we ſhall be approved or rejected, as we have *finiſhed* well or ill. In perfect uniſon with theſe ideas, it is written, "to *day*, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation. Take heed, brethren, leſt there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God; but exhort one another daily, while it is called *to day*."† "*Now* is the accepted time, behold, *now* is the *day* of ſalvation."‡ *John* the baptiſt, in his preaching, compares the national church of the *Jews* to a threſhing floor covered with wheat and chaff, and ſays of our Lord, "he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."§ The good are compared to wheat, the bad to chaff. The former are to be gathered into a ſafe and ſecure place, the latter are to be deſtroyed—not to paſs through a new and *fiery* trial, in order that they may be thereby turned into wheat.

We read—"God ſo loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould *not iperiſh*, but have *everlaſting life*."‖ He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved, but he that believeth not ſhall be damned,"¶ or condemned in a judicial way to future puniſhment. The laſt quotation was ſpoken by our Lord, after his reſurrection, a little before his aſcenſion, and when commiſſioning his

* John 9. 4. † Heb. 3. 7, 8, 12, 13. ‡ 2 Cor. 6. 2.
§ Matt. 3. 12. ‖ John 3. 16. ¶ Mark 16. 16.

his apoſtles to preach the goſpel to every human creature; and ſo deſerves ſpecial attention. It would be tedious to the reader, to mention all the paſſages, where ſalvation or eternal life are promiſed to every one who repenteth and believeth on the Lord Jeſus; and where it is threatened, *expreſly* or by *manifeſt* implication, that whoſoever believeth not ſhall not ſee life, ſhall periſh, ſhall be damned or condemned to future puniſhment: *Salvation* and *eternal life* in ſuch paſſages are evidently ſynonymous; and ſo are *not ſeeing life*, *periſhing*, *being damned*, or *condemned*. The former and the latter are *contraſted* to each other as *oppoſites*. But what becomes of the *contraſt*, if the threatening only means, that unbelievers ſhall be condemned and puniſhed for a while, and after that ſhall be bleſſed with eternal life? The firſt preachers of the goſpel muſt have been thought egregious triflers or worſe, if, while they ſpake as they did, they intended no more than *this*; and had a *reſerved ſubterfuge*, according to which the vileſt miſcreant that ever went to the grave will at length be ſaved. Many perſons, when they have entertained a pleaſing opinion, through an indolence of temper, will not be at the pains of examining into the truth or falſehood of it. They had rather be deluded by an agreeable dream, though to their future damage; than be awakened to a ſenſe of danger, time enough to eſcape the approaching evil. I would hope better of ſome into whoſe hands this may fall; and therefore go on, and note, that the moſt and beſt arguments of the pamphlet in behalf of the *Reſtoration of all mankind to final happineſs* are taken from the writings of the apoſtle *Paul*. Let us examine whether the *interpretation* given to the paſſages quoted from him, doth not contradict what he advanceth in other places; for if ſo, *ſuch* interpretation *cannot* be the *true* one.

Paul

Paul tells the Romans,* that "all things work together for good *to them that love God*, to *the called* according to his purpose;" and, in support of it, adds, "whom he did foreknow, he did also predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son; moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Not to enter into dispute about the meaning of *foreknowledge*, *predestination*, and *calling*; the passage connects these with being *justified* and *glorified*, and appropriates the whole to *certain* individuals, to the exclusion of *others*—to *them that* love God, to *the called* according to his purpose. We may as well argue, that a *part* is the *whole*; as that *all* are foreknown, *all* are predestinated, *all* are called, *all* are justified, and *all* are glorified—or as that *all* are glorified and restored to final happiness, though *some only* are foreknown, predestinated, called, and justified.

In his epistle to the *Hebrews*, he declares it impossible for those who were once enlightned, and had tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the holy Ghost, and had tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, should they apostatize, to be renewed again unto repentance; and then represents their unhappy doom by the following illustration, "for the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God: but that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, *whose end is to be burned.*"† How puerile and impertinent is this illustration, if the end of the greatest apostate is only to pass through a temporary burning, in order to his *receiving a blessing from God*, and being made finally happy! He also warns them, saying, "see that ye refuse not him that speaketh, for if they escaped

* Rom. 8. 28—30. † Heb. 6. 4—8.

eſcaped not, who refuſed him that ſpake on earth, much more ſhall not we eſcape, if we turn away from him that ſpeaketh from heaven."* Could it enter into the head of any believing ſenſible *Jew*, who recollected how the refuſers in the time of *Moſes* were deſtroyed, that the apoſtle *ſecretly* admitted, that ſhould they turn away from him that ſpake from heaven, they would eſcape notwithſtanding, and in length of time become the companions of them that *ſerve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear.*

When he writes to the *Corinthians*, "but with many of them God was not well pleaſed; for they were overthrown in the wilderneſs;" he ſubjoins, "now theſe things were *our examples*," and again a little lower, "now all theſe things happened unto them for *enſamples*, and they are written for our admonition."† What was it that happened unto them? For their diſobedience murmuring and luſts, they were overthrown in the wilderneſs, they were deſtroyed of the deſtroyer, and were never ſuffered to enter the *promiſed land*. But how are theſe *our examples*, if after having given into the higheſt acts of diſobedience, indulged the baſeſt luſts, and allowed ourſelves in the moſt indecent murmurings againſt the divine conduct, through life, we are admitted into it? Upon Mr. *White*'s principle, they were written *in vain*, and have *no admonition* in them; for they do not *préfigure* the abſolute and perpetual excluſion of any from the *heavenly Canaan*, though the deſtruction of the *Jews* in the wilderneſs was an abſolute and perpetual excluſion of all ſuch from the *earthly one*. From the paſſages now quoted it is evident, that *Paul* was oppoſed to the *Reſtoration of all mankind to final happineſs*, whatever ſome inquiſitors may attempt forcing him to ſpeak, by putting his expreſſions to the rack and torture.

It

* Heb. 12. 25. † 1 Cor. 10. 5, 6, 11.

It remaineth, that we attend particularly to the *great Prophet* of the church, whom if the chriſtian profeſſor will not hear, it is vain to think of calling other evidence. Our Lord teſtified, that "ſtrait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and *few* there be that find it."† Others maintain, that, though this is true in reference to the *direct* road unto life, yet there is another round about way leading from deſtruction, which, the many, who for the preſent prefer the wide gate and the broad way, will at laſt hit upon, ſo that *all* without exception ſhall have life. Could the multitudes of common people, who liſtened to our Lord's ſermon underſtand him in this light? Or did he mean to impoſe upon their credulity? Or did he not believe what he taught? each was impoſſible. But his parable of the rich man and *Lazarus* will admit of no ſuch gloſs. In that he introduces *Abraham* as ſaying to the rich man in hell, "betwixt us and you there is a great gulf fixed; ſo that they which would paſs from hence to you cannot; neither can they paſs to us, that would come from thence."‡ Had Mr *White*'s admirers the modeſty that the poor tormented wretch had, they would give up the point, upon receiving ſuch an anſwer from heaven, uttered by the father of the faithful, though they might like him imagine, that a meſſenger from the inviſible world would be more convincing, than *Moſes* and the prophets, with Jeſus the evangeliſts and apoſtles. But they may plead, that this was a parable and a fiction. True, it was ſo; and a proper vehicle to convey inſtructions, after a ſtriking and forcible manner never to be forgotten, into the minds of the attentive audience. One of theſe inſtructions, and which could not be miſtaken, by them, unleſs they poſſeſſed Mr. *White*'s ingenuity, was, that if they were once caſt into hell, they could never paſs from

† Matt. 7. 14. ‡ Luke 16. 26.

from thence to heaven. This was a truth, or it was not. If it was not, but artfully employed to terrify from bad practices, the character of our Saviour is impeached and his name blaſphemed: he becomes a *Machiavelian* inſtructor, and does evil that good may come of it: he *deceives* his hearers that he may preſerve them from vice. However, let Jeſus be true, and every man a liar. Whether he ſpake plainly or in parables he taught the truth; and therefore the wicked, whether rich or poor, learned or unlearned, when once caſt into hell ſhall never paſs from thence to heaven.

In his anſwer* to the Sadducean objection againſt the reſurrection, it is manifeſtly implied, that *all men* would *not* be ſaved: for while he ſaith, "they which ſhall be *accounted worthy* to obtain that world" where they neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can die any more, but are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God; he alſo teacheth, that *all* will *not* be *accounted worthy*.

Upon another occaſion our Lord declared, "he that ſhall blaſpheme againſt the holy Ghoſt hath not forgiveneſs for ever, but is obnoxious to everlaſting condemnation"† (or damnation) according to the original. "The blaſphemy againſt the *holy* Ghoſt ſhall not be forgiven unto men; whoſoever ſpeaketh againſt the holy Ghoſt it ſhall not be forgiven him—neither in this world, nor in that which is to come."‡ How could our Lord have more *expreſsly* aſſured the *Jews*, that blaſphemers againſt the holy Ghoſt would remain *perpetually* unpardoned? He ſays poſitively that "they ſhall *not* be forgiven;" and to give the greater weight to his words, hath a recourſe to the *proverbial expreſſion* by which it was uſual to ſignify, in the ſtrongeſt terms poſſible, that things ſhould never be—"they ſhall not be forgiven—*neither in this world, nor in that which*

* Luke 20. 35. † Mark 3. 29. ‡ Matt. 12. 31, 32.

is to come." According to Mark he ſaid alſo, in the ſame diſcourſe, of ſuch blaſphemer, "he hath not forgiveneſs *for ever*, but is obnoxious to *everlaſting condemnation*" (or damnation.) We muſt then believe, that the guilt of ſuch blaſphemy will ever remain unpardoned; and, if ſo, the blaſphemer cannot be admitted into heaven. If the repeated poſitive aſſertions of our Lord, though expreſſed in the moſt forcible language, are not to be credited, where are we!

Can it be *ſeriouſly* ſaid in anſwer to this argument, that "the blaſphemer will continue in hell, till by his ſufferings he hath *fully ſatisfy'd* for the *unpardonable ſin*; and that he will afterward upon a change of character remove to heaven?" It may be replied, that then upon this removal he may go about boaſting among the glorified, that "he is leſs obliged to Chriſt than they, for that his greateſt ſin was not pardoned for the ſake of Chriſt, and that he himſelf made a *complete compenſation for it without any abatement.*" But it may be thought more to the purpoſe to obſerve, that if the blaſphemer can by ſuffering compenſate for the ſin againſt the holy Ghoſt, and yet continue to exiſt in a capacity of being afterwards for ever happy; then the ſinner doth not, by the *greateſt ſin* he can poſſibly commit, *forfeit* his *exiſtence*; for the unpardonable ſin is repreſented as the greateſt poſſible.

But to come to the caſe of *Judas*, concerning whom, on account of his treaſon, our Lord aſſures us, "it had been good for that man, if he had not been born."† This muſt neceſſarily imply, that the traitor will never be finally happy: for if ever he was to enter upon eternal life, it was certainly good for him that he was born into exiſtence; though his ſufferings prior to it, ſhould have continued for a period of as many millions of years as would be contained in a line of figures from this

† Mat. 26. 24.

this paper to the ſun, or even the moſt diſtant ſtar; for ſuch a period of ſuffering would not bear ſo much proportion to eternal happineſs, as the unit one does in number to ſuch a line of figures, or a moment in time to ſuch a period. Temporary puniſhment however protracted is *nought* when compared with everlaſting bleſſedneſs. The inſtance of *Judas* is then in point, and decides the controverſy, that there cannot be a "Reſtoration of *all* mankind to final happineſs;" becauſe it would have been well for that man if he had not been born.

Now let us try, whether the other texts, quoted in the pamphlet, will admit of an interpretation agreeing with what hath been already advanced: they muſt, or there is a manifeſt oppoſition between different parts of ſcripture—the more eaſy and natural ſuch interpretation, the more ſatisfactory it will prove. The apoſtle writing to *Timothy* could not do otherwiſe than ſay "God *our* Saviour," as he was *their* ſaviour, even though *no other* than *Paul* and *Timothy* were ſaved; and the extenſion of the pronoun *our* to *all* mankind is a violence, which though too often practiſed by, is notwithſtanding a ſcandal to diſputants. When in the 4th ch. 10 v. he ſtiles God the *Saviour of all men*; it is not in alluſion to *ſpiritual*, but *temporal* deliverance. We read (Judges 3. 9) "the Lord raiſed up a *deliverer* to the children of Iſrael;" and again (15 v.) "the Lord raiſed them up a *deliverer*;" in the *Hebrew* it is a *Saviour*, as noted in the margin of ſome bibles: the Septuagint uſe the ſame word as in *Timothy*. *Samuel* tells the Jews (1 Sam. 10. 19) "ye have this day rejected your God, who himſelf *ſaved* you out of all your adverſities and your tribulations." The Septuagint tranſlate it, "who himſelf is the *Saviour* of you, out of all your evils and your tribulations," employing the

Greek

Greek word the apoſtle doth: and this they do in many other places, ſo that God the *Saviour*, my *Saviour*, our *Saviour*, and the *Saviour* of *Iſrael* are very common, even when *temporal* deliverance is plainly intended. In the beginning of the verſe *Paul* writes, for the end of advancing godlineſs (" for this thing therefore" in the original) we both labour and ſuffer reproach; he then aſſigns the reaſon for their labouring and ſuffering reproach, notwithſtanding the dangers and fatigues attending them, and adds, " becauſe we truſt in the living God, who is the Saviour, *preſerver*, *protector*, or *deliverer*, of all men, eſpecially of thoſe that believe." The title anſwers to that in Job 7. 20. *Preſerver of men*. *Paul* refers to God's providential kindneſs, by which he preſerves and defends all men, but *more eſpecially* the faithful.

We are told, " that all men, *reprobate* as well as *elect*, have *one* and the *ſelf ſame God*. The *elect* have not *one* God, and *reprobate another*; but *one God* is the God of them *both*. To adopt the words in *Malachy* 2. 10. " *Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us?*" yea, the ſame good and kind and merciful God and father made all. So then we ſee the bleſſed God ſtands in the ſame near and tender relation to the whole human race." A noble diſcovery! But was it deſigned to *convince*, or to *confound* the reader? Had not the *zeal* of the publiſher out ran his *judgment*, he never would have ſuffered ſo ſophiſtical a paragraph to have made its appearance. By way of anſwer I retort the argument. God is the parent of the univerſe. Men and angels, *Abraham* and *Judas*, the minuteſt inſect and the moſt glorious Cherubim, the holieſt Seraphim and the impureſt devil, *Beelzebub* and *Gabriel* have *one* and the *ſelf ſame* God. The *good angel* hath not *one* God, and the *bad angel another*; but

one

one God is the God of them both. To adopt the words in *Malachy*, "*Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us?*"—*all* whether ſtones or trees, inſects, birds, beaſts or fiſhes, ſaints or ſinners, angels or devils? yea, the ſame good and kind and merciful God and father made all *creatures*. So then we ſee the bleſſed God ſtands in the ſame near and tender relation to the *whole creation*." But will it from hence follow, that he muſt make *all equally happy* in proportion to their reſpective capacities? Or that he muſt not puniſh *any* who are diſobedient and rebellious? Or, that he is *cruel and unmerciful* ſhould he prepare everlaſting fire for the devil and his angels; or ſhould he conſign to the ſame, the wicked and impenitent among mankind? Will ſuch doctrine agree with the words of *Iſaiah*? (27th 11 v.) "It is a people of no underſtanding, therefore he that *made* them[x] will ſhew them *no favour*." If a people may be thus dealt with, when univerſally abandoned, though there may be certain good characters among them—a *Noah*, a *Daniel*, a *Job*——much more may the worſt individuals.

What Mr. *White* obſerves of the *one mediator* between God and man, is as little to the purpoſe, as his ſophiſtical paragraph about the *one God*. *Chriſt Jeſus* mediates, not for the *Jew* or the *Greek* only, the circumciſed or the uncircumciſed, the free or the bond, but for the whole human race without exception, who embrace and comply with the goſpel. And the *value* of his atonement was *ſuch*, that divine juſtice can acquit every one who repents and believes, agreeable to the goſpel-proclamation; therefore it is with propriety ſaid, "who gave himſelf a *ranſom for all*:" but it doth by no means follow, that therefore in *juſtice* all men *muſt* be ſaved, or that the *blood* of *Chriſt* loſes its virtue. The virtue of *Chriſt's* blood was deſigned to ſave men in perfect harmony

[x] will not have mercy on them, & he that formed them

harmony with the divine holineſs and juſtice, which require repentance and faith, according to the eſtabliſhed mode of redemption; while then it ſaves *each individual* that repents and believes, it is not in any true ſenſe *loſt*, though *numbers periſh* through their own impenitence and unbelief: ſo that Mr. *White* aſſigns a falſe motive for the apoſtle's adding—*to be teſtified in due time* —neither do theſe words mean as he pretendeth, "that there ſhall be a time, when, *from the actual ſalvation of every individual* (which though not *printed* is evidently intended) it will be manifeſt that *all men* are ranſomed and bought by the blood of Chriſt:" the original is literally—*the teſtimony in due time*, or *proper ſeaſon*——and therefore admits of different eaſy conſtructions without our being obliged to fly to this *unſcriptural* one.

The reaſoning that hath been now uſed, to ſet the paſſage in 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. in its true light, and to correct the miſconſtruction put upon it in the pamphlet, may be applied to 1 John 2. 2. "If any man ſin we have an advocate with the father, *Jeſus Chriſt* the righteous, who is the propitiation for *our* ſins, and not for ours only, but for the ſins of the WHOLE WORLD." However Mr. *White* may exclaim—"A text ſo worded with a *not only*, and the *Whole World* looks as if the Spirit had purpoſely conſulted to obviate and prevent all *clippings* of it:" yet it muſt be *clipped* of his comments; or the Spirit will not be *conſiſtent*, and teach the *ſame* doctrines in different parts of ſcripture, but contrary ones. The apoſtle *John* wrote this epiſtle, as muſt be ſuppoſed, to believers within *certain* limits. Under a ſenſe of the ſinful infirmities attending him and thoſe whom he addreſſed, he ſaith, "who is the propitiation for *our* ſins;" but *they* were not the *only* believers who were thus privileged; the bleſſing was common

to

to all of that character, without any regard to their circumſtances, nation or place of abode; his benevolent heart glows with the thought, and in an extaſy of pleaſure he adds, "and *not* for *ours only*, but for the ſins of the WHOLE WORLD," meaning believers whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, every where over the whole world. The propriety of the addition will be ſtill more apparent, were the perſons addreſſed moſtly *Jews* or very much ſo; for ſuch might be ſtill tainted with the bigotry and pride of their nation, who held the beſt of the uncircumciſed *Greeks*, and much more *Barbarians* and *Scythians*, as unfit for converſation and company; and could not bear the thought of their admiſſion to equal privileges with themſelves in the Meſſiah's kingdom.

The *ingenious* Mr. *White* purſuing his ſubject, refers us to *Romans* 5. from the 15th to the 19th v. *But not as the offence, ſo alſo is the free gift: for if through the offence of one, many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jeſus Chriſt, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that ſinned, ſo is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto juſtification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteouſneſs, ſhall reign in life by one, Jeſus Chriſt. Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even ſo by the righteouſneſs of one, the free gift came upon all men, unto juſtification of life. For as by one man's aiſobedience many were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous.*

The paſſage is not without its intricacies; but upon examination will be found *not* to favour Mr. *White*'s ſcheme. The epiſtle was directed to believers, *beloved*

of

of God, called and *holy*. *Paul* ſets himſelf, in the latter part of the chapter, to "ſhew that the calamities brought by the *firſt Adam* on *his* ſeed, are repaired with glorious advantage to all who by faith become intereſted in the *ſecond Adam*;" as is obſerved by Dr. *Doddridge*; who in his note upon the 12th v. ſays "as this verſe is an inference from the 11th, it ſeems evident that believers only are ſpoken of; for it is plain from comparing the 9th, 10th, and 11th verſes with the 1ſt, that it is only they, *who are juſtified by faith, who have peace with God, and who joy in him by Chriſt as having received the reconciliation.* And this obvious remark clears the following paſſage of difficulties, which would be exceeding great, if it were to be conſidered without regard to this connection, and which have in fact, miſled many *commentators*; who for want of attending to it, have plunged themſelves and their readers into great perplexity, and given a ſenſe to the paragraph, of which it is by no means capable." He afterwards remarks, that the 12th, 18th and 19th verſes make one continued ſentence, and that the intermediate verſes do undoubtedly come in as a parentheſis.

In the 14th v. *Adam* is ſtiled the figure, or model of him who was to come, viz, the *Meſſiah* or *ſecond Adam*. Each is deſcribed as a publick perſon or federal head, to his reſpective ſeed or poſterity—herein they agreed; but *not* in this (whatever Mr. *White* aſſerts) "that they each, by turns, *repreſented mankind.*" Neither do the words *many* and *all*, wherever they occur in this paſſage, take in the *whole* human race: when connected with the *firſt Adam* they take in *all his ſeed*; and when connected with the *ſecond Adam* they take in *all his*, but none other. Mr. *White* unwarily for himſelf admits the diſtinction between the

ſeed

ſeed of the firſt and of the ſecond *Adam*, while he ſpeaks of "the one ſin of Adam's being charged upon *all his* ſeed, and the abundance of *Chriſt's* righteouſneſs being imputed to *his* ſeed." The ſeed of *Adam* includes *all* mankind deſcending from him in the ordinary way; and the ſeed of *Chriſt* intends the *believing part* of mankind, as is evident from this chapter and other parts of ſcripture. Herein *Adam* and *Chriſt* agree, that they are publick perſons; and that they convey important conſequences to their particular poſterity; but they differ in ſeveral reſpects. *Adam* conveyed to *his* poſterity, *ſin* and *death*; Chriſt conveyeth to *his*, *righteouſneſs* and *life*. Nor is the *offence* and the *free gift* exactly alike. "*Through the offence of one*, Adam, the *multitude* of his poſterity *died*; but *the grace of God and the gift by grace which is by one man, Jeſus Chriſt, hath much more abounded to the multitude* of his poſterity, and that in two very important articles. In the firſt place, *the gift* is *not* merely *as* the ruin that came upon us *by one that ſinned* in reſpect of the number of offences in queſtion; *for the ſentence of one* offence paſſed upon us *to condemnation*; *but the free gift* is effectual *to* our *juſtification from many offences*. *Moreover*, in the next place, *if by one man's offence death reigned by one* over all his poſterity; then *they who* thankfully and obediently *receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteouſneſs, ſhall much more reign in life by* the *one* reſtorer and recoverer of his ſeed, *even Jeſus Chriſt*; they ſhall by him be brought to a much nobler and more excellent life than that from which Adam fell and which they loſt in him." The agreement between *Adam* and *Chriſt* in conveying important conſequences (though the conſequences are extremely different) each to his particular poſterity is ſummarily ſtated in the 18th

and 19th verſes, when the apoſtle reſumes the ſubject he had began in the 12th v, having finiſhed his parentheſis. "*Therefore as by one offence* the federal influence was *to all men unto condemnation, ſo alſo by one grand act of righteouſneſs* the federal influence is *to all men* who receive and embrace it *unto juſtification of life; for as by the diſobedience of one man many were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one*, i. e. of Chriſt, *ſhall many be made righteous.*"

The above paraphraſe is chiefly an abridgment of Dr. Doddridge's, with a few ſmall alterations.

The paſſage we have been conſidering appears to be written much after the modern curt ſentimental manner—in broken, incomplete ſentences—to be perfected by the contemplative mind of the knowing and judicious reader. But not to evade the force of it as quoted in ſupport of Univerſal Salvation. It is pleaded—"there is one offence upon *all men* to condemnation, and the righteouſneſs of one upon *all men* to juſtification;" and it may be urged "there is an oppoſition between that condemnation which comes upon *all men* through the offence of one, and that juſtification of life which comes upon *all men* by the righteouſneſs of one, i. e. of *Chriſt*; and therefore *all men* muſt be taken in the ſame ſenſe in both parts of the verſe, and conſequently muſt be extended to *all mankind.*" This ſtates the argument rather ſtronger than is done by Mr. *White*. "But it is not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the terms of oppoſition have any reſpect to the *univerſal extent* of condemnation and juſtification, for the apoſtle's deſign is not to compare the *number* of thoſe who ſhall be juſtified, with that of thoſe who are condemned by the fall of *Adam*; but to compare the two heads together, *Adam* and *Chriſt*; and to ſhew, that as we are liable to condemnation by the one, ſo

we

we obtain righteouſneſs by the other." From what was before noted it appears, that the terms *all* and *many*, when deſigned to expreſs the numbers benefited by *Chriſt*, as a federal head, comprehend *his ſeed only*, and not all mankind; which may be farther argued from the *nature* of the *privileges* with which ſuch are benefited. They are of the higheſt importance, nothing leſs than *juſtification*, or a judicial acquittal from the guilt of many offences, together with *eternal life*: and "it is ſo plain, that they are appropriated to perſons of a particular character, expreſſed (in the 17th v.) by *receiving the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteouſneſs*, that it is ſurpriſing any ſhould have ſpoken of them as *common* to the whole human race. And nothing is more evident, than that the original word for *receive* often ſignifies *being active in embracing* a benefit propoſed, or a perſon offering himſelf under a character of importance."*

Mr. *White* admits, that none but thoſe, who *now lay hold* on the gift of righteouſneſs, have the *immediate benefit* of it; but ſalves the difficulty, by ſuppoſing that others will reap the benefit of it *hereafter*, and by pleading that the word *all* muſt be taken as univerſally when *juſtification* through the righteouſneſs of *Chriſt* is ſpoken of, as when *condemnation* through the offence of *Adam*.

This plea hath been already anſwered; but he attempts to ſtrengthen it by ſaying, for *all died in Adam* and therefore *all ſhall be made alive in Chriſt*. Theſe words he quoted before, and inferred from them the reſurrection of *believers* and *unbelievers*: herein he was not ſingular: others have done the ſame, but without attending ſufficiently to the chapter from whence they are taken; in which the apoſtle treats *not*, of the reſurrection of the ungodly; but *only* of *Chriſt's*

* See Dr. Doddridge's note.

Chriſt's and that of *believers*, as conſequent upon *his*. When he writes (1 Cor. 15. 16——20) "if *Chriſt* be not raiſed, *your faith* is vain: then they which are fallen *aſleep in Chriſt* are periſhed. If in this life only *we* have hope in *Chriſt*, *we* are of all men moſt miſerable. But now is *Chriſt* riſen from the dead, and become the *firſt fruits* of them that ſlept;" it is evident that he hath his eye to believers, with reſpect to *whom only Chriſt* is the *firſt fruits*; he is not the *firſt fruits* of them who come forth from their graves to the reſurrection of damnation. When *Paul* ſaith therefore, "ſince by man came death, by man came alſo the reſurrection of the dead; for as in *Adam all* die, even ſo in *Chriſt* ſhall *all* be made alive" (v. 21, 22.) we muſt underſtand the reſurrection of the dead as referring *only* to the reſurrection of *pious believers*, and the *all that are made alive* as intending them: in which we are confirmed by the following verſes of the chapter: for "every man *is raiſed* in his *own* order, *Chriſt* the firſt fruits, and afterward *they that are Chriſt*'s, at his coming:" by *they that are Chriſt*'s is meant they that had fallen aſleep in *Chriſt*, or deceaſed chriſtians. The apoſtle doth not proceed to mention a word about the reſurrection of the ungodly: but when he comes to anſwer objections againſt the doctrine of the reſurrection aſſerts that the dead body is raiſed in *glory*—in *power*—*a ſpiritual body*, *in the image of Chriſt's heavenly body*, ſo that *death is* triumphantly *ſwallowed up in victory*: which aſſertions can never be applied to them, who come forth from their graves to the reſurrection of damnation, and awake to ſhame and everlaſting contempt.

The laſt quotation preſented us from Mr. *White*, is, his remarks upon Eph. 1. 9, 10; and Col. 1. 20. The apoſtle writes to the *Epheſians*, "having made known

known unto us *the myſtery* of his will, according to his good pleaſure which he hath purpoſed in himſelf," v. 9. The myſtery ſpoken of is *not*, that the wicked part of the creation, whether men or devils, ſhould, with the holy part of it, be reheaded in *Chriſt*; but that the benefits of the goſpel were common to the *Gentiles* with the *Jews*. "The calling of the *Gentiles* had been long a ſecret, of which neither they nor the *Jews* had any conception, till revealed by the holy Spirit to the *Apoſtles*." That this is meant by *the myſtery* here, is evident from the beginning of the 3d chapter to the 10th v. and it is called *the myſtery of Chriſt* (in the 4th v. of the 3d chapter and in Col. 4. 3.) This was *the myſtery* for which the apoſtle was in bonds (Eph. 6. 19. Col. 4. 3.) We may ſay with Dr. Taylor (in his note upon Rom. 5. 18.) "the grand point in view is the extenſiveneſs of the grace of the goſpel, in oppoſition to the narrow principles of the *Jews*, who would have confined ſalvation within the pale of their peculiarity." Had not Mr. *White*'s prejudice diverted him from attending to this important point, he would have found the key by which to have opened the next words: but he firſt fixes an unſcriptural ſenſe upon the 10th verſe, and then tells us *that* is *the myſtery* ſpoken of in the 9th. The calling of the *Gentiles* to a full participation of ſimilar privileges with the *Jews* was *that myſtery*, which was ſo ordered, "that in the diſpenſation of the fulneſs of times, he (i. e. God) might reunite under one head all things in *Chriſt*, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." Dr. *Doddridge* hath the following note on the laſt clauſe, containing the true ſenſe of the verſe. "*Both in heaven and earth* is conſidered by ſome, as a *Jewiſh* phraſe to expreſs the *whole world*; and Mr. *Locke* thinks it may be equivalent

lent to *Jews* and *Gentiles*. But it ſeems moſt reaſonable to underſtand it, of bringing *Angels* as well as *men* under the government of *Chriſt*. The original verb muſt, in its moſt literal ſignification, expreſs *uniting again under one head*. Both *Angels* and *men* were at firſt in ſweet and harmonious *ſubjection* to the *Son of God*, the great Creator of both; but *man* having broke himſelf off from the ſociety, the *Son of Man* by his humiliation and ſufferings *recovers all* who believe in him, and in his human nature *preſides over the kingdom* to which in the world of glory, *they* and his *angels* belong. This interpretation preſents us with a noble view," and preſerves the *harmony* of ſcripture doctrines, while Mr. *White*'s makes them a *jumble of diſcords*.

The church at *Coloſſe* conſiſted chiefly of *Gentile* converts, as did that at *Epheſus*; and *Paul*'s epiſtle to it was written as that to the *Epheſians*, when he was in bonds. He takes ſpecial notice in both of that *myſtery of Chriſt*, of which we have been ſpeaking; and in Col. 1. 20. expreſſeth the ſame ſentiment we have conſidered, with a ſmall variation in words, "and (having made peace through the blood of his croſs) by him to reconcile all things to himſelf, by him, I ſay, whether they be things on earth or things in heaven." On which Dr. *Doddridge* remarks, "Dr. *Whitby* would render it, *by him to make all things friendly in him, making peace between them by the blood of his croſs*; and I apprehend, that to be the true ſenſe, and the only ſenſe in which *things in heaven* can be ſaid to be reconciled; when a breach commenced between man and the bleſſed God, the angels, as faithful ſubjects, muſt join with him againſt the rebellious creature, and be ready to act as enemies to him, while he continued the enemy of God," but, upon that breach's being made up by the blood of the croſs, angels are reconciled to man.

Mr.

Mr. *White* harps upon the comprehenſive terms *all things*, which he or his extractor gives us in *capitals*. He tells us, "And when he, i. e. the apoſtle, ſays, *all things*, it is manifeſt *nothing is excepted*. Had he not been bigotted, he would have recollected, that though the word is *things*, the apoſtle intends *perſons* or rational beings; and that therefore *many things may be excepted*, eſpecially the *everlaſting fire* prepared for the devil and his angels, and the *worm that dieth not*, which are generally ſuppoſed to be *in hell* and not *on* earth. There have been, and may be ſtill, maggotty people, who have ſuppoſed hell to be ſomewhere *in* or *under* the earth; but if the apoſtle had foreſeen it, he could not have taken a more effectual method to have prevented our ſuppoſing, that ſuch as were confined there would be united again, with the reſt of the creation, under one head in Chriſt Jeſus; for though when he ſpeaks of heaven he uſes a prepoſition whoſe general meaning is *in*, when he ſpeaks of earth he changes it to another which means *on*, *upon*, or *above*. Mr. *White* might poſſibly have triumphed had the apoſtle ſaid, "which are *in* heaven and which are *in* earth;" and yet, as it is not granted by all, that hell is ſomewhere *in* or *under* the earth, it might ſtill have been maintained that the apoſtle ought to have been more explicit, and after having ſaid "which are *in* heaven and which are *in* earth," ſhould have added, "and which are *in* hell:" but for want of this, all Mr. *White*'s concluſion "there is nothing either *in heaven* or *earth* which ſhall not finally be reconciled to God, and be reduced to a proper ſtate of ſubjection," is nothing more in ſupport of *Univerſal reſtoration to favour*, than if he had told us, *in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*. It may not be amiſs to note, that the change of the prepoſition from *in* to *on* is in

both

both *Epheſians* and *Coloſſians*. It is needleſs to dwell upon the futility of laying ſtreſs upon the term *all*, after what hath been ſo fully proved above, that it is often very far from including every individual.

—"Thus much for the excellent *Jeremiah White*," at preſent: proceed we to another writer upon the ſame ſubject of *Salvation for all men*; who, though not honoured as Mr. *White* with the epithet *excellent*, is certainly as *extraordinary* an interpreter of the ſacred oracles.

The apoſtle being led to ſpeak of the reſurrection of believers at the coming of *Chriſt* (1 Cor. 15. 23.) without damping his preſent joyful feelings, ariſing from the contemplation of a glorious reſurrection, by ſtaying to take notice of the awful ſolemnities of the laſt judgment, ſprings forward in his views to the conſummation of the mediatorial ſcheme, and crys out, "then, or after that, the end! when he ſhall deliver up the kingdom to God even the Father; when he ſhall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power: for he muſt reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The laſt enemy *that* ſhall be deſtroyed, *is* death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he ſaith, all things are put under him, it is manifeſt, that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things ſhall be ſubdued unto him, then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." But there is "*a great deal to be done after the ſecond coming of Chriſt*, for the accompliſhment of which, *a long period of time* may be requiſite," before this end cometh; as the day of judgment according to ſcripture follows upon *Chriſt*'s ſecond advent. Before this end cometh, *univerſal ſubjection to Chriſt* ſhall take place; agreeable to the *ſtrong* and *extenſive* terms that

are

are uſed; from which our extraordinary interpreter infers, that the *univerſal ſubjection to Chriſt* implies the *total* and *abſolute* deſtruction of *ſin, Satan* and *death*, the *ſecond* no leſs than the *firſt*, and the reduction of the *whole human race* under a *free* and yet *full* ſubjection to the government of God, ſo as to be the *meet objects of his mercy*, when he ſhall *finally* take *the kingdom into his own hands*. He charges the *common explanation* of the paſſage with giving us a *poor, low* idea of the *final effect* of *Chriſt*'s reign, in compariſon of what he contends for. It may ſo, in the opinion of one, who appears to be wiſe above what is written, and to leave the common explanation, that he may force upon us an *uncommon* one, in order to ſerve a purpoſe. To ſerve this purpoſe he unfairly introduces into the paſſage a diſtinction that hath nothing to do with it, *the diſtinction* between the firſt and ſecond death; and then very artfully endeavours to palm upon his reader, the *pooreſt* and *loweſt* of all ideas, even a *falſe one*, that the apoſtle ſpake of the ſecond death as well as of the firſt, when he ſaid, "the laſt enemy that ſhall be deſtroyed is *death*:" whereas it is plain from the whole chapter, that he ſpeaks of that *firſt corporeal death* which is deſtroyed by the reſurrection. This death is the laſt enemy "that continues to hold in ſome ſort the ſubjects of *Chriſt* under its dominion;" and is the *laſt* to be totally and literally deſtroyed; and its deſtruction commenceth upon the ſounding of that trumpet which announceth the coming of *Chriſt* to judgment. Now if this death is the *laſt* enemy to be totally and literally deſtroyed, what becomes of our author's ſcheme? For after its deſtruction followeth that awful judgment which will conſign the devil and his angels and the ungodly race of mankind to the pains of the ſecond death; and thus the abſolute deſtruction of *ſin, Satan*

and the *ſecond death*, as built upon this paſſage, is totally ſet aſide, and numbers of the ſons of Adam will be *juſtly* confined for having been, and continuing to be, REBELS againſt the government of God—whether *everlaſtingly confined* in hell remains to be enquired into.

The *common explanation* may be pronounced *poor* and *low*; but if the *true* one, and according to the divine mind, it would argue more wiſdom and piety to withhold the epithets. It is not what we wiſh or fancy; but what the Lord reveals that we are to receive for truth: and while profeſſed believers in ſcripture, as a revelation from heaven, we ſhould be upon our guard, leſt our wiſhes and fancies ſhould impoſe an *uninſpired* ſenſe upon it.

All rule, and all authority and power is put down, and all enemies are ſubdued, and all things put under the feet of *Chriſt*, when they are either brought into a willing and holy ſubjection to him, or are vanquiſhed and puniſhed by him, ſo as fully to diſplay his ſuperiority and ſovereignty over them; and we are led to conceive of the latter rather than of the former, by the terms "till he hath put *all enemies under his feet*." The expreſſion inclines us to apprehend, that the perſons in this ſtate of ſubjection are *ſtill enemies*, who deſerve to be trampled under foot; inſtead of *true penitents*, reduced to a *free* and *full* ſubjection, *meet objects of God's mercy*, and fit to enter upon the joys of heaven: and is, therefore, wholly ſubverſive of the author's deſign in quoting the paſſage.

He is certainly an uncommon genius, or he would never have thought of finding in the *firſt promiſe* of a Saviour, the doctrine of *Salvation for all men*. He tells us that the words (in Gen. 3. 15.) *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy ſeed and her ſeed; he ſhall bruiſe thy head, and thou ſhalt bruiſe his heel*; are deſigned to convey the thought of

that

that "*complete victory*, which *Chriſt*, the ſeed of the woman, ſhould gain over the *devil*, there ſpoken of under the emblem of a ſerpent: for the words are evidently an alluſion to the way of *deſtroying* ſerpents, by ſtriking their head. To *bruiſe a ſerpent's head* is a phraſe expreſſive of *one* and the *ſame* thing with *killing a ſerpent*" One would imagine, that the next paragraph ſhould therefore have been, "Conſequently, when it is ſaid of Chriſt, that he ſhould *bruiſe the ſerpent's head*, the idea obviouſly and naturally communicated by the words, is, that he *ſhall deſtroy the devil*," his very being, ſo that he ſhould not live any longer; but contrary to our author's own premiſes, it is, "not his *being*, but that *kingdom of his*, which as a *tempter*, he has introduced into the world, accompanied with *ſorrow* and *death*:" and thus, according to our author's reaſoning, though the ſerpent means the *devil*; and though to *bruiſe a ſerpent's head*, is a phraſe expreſſive of *one* and the *ſame* thing with *killing a ſerpent*, the *devil himſelf* is *not* to be *deſtroyed*, he is to eſcape; and the ſtroke inſtead of *killing him*, is only to deſtroy the kingdom he hath ſet up in the world. But ſtill, if our author is right; and "*this firſt promiſe* of God fairly leads us to look for the time when *ſin that work of the devil* ſhall be *totally* and *abſolutely* deſtroyed by him who was born of a woman;" then either the devil, or his deviliſm muſt be deſtroyed, and he be converted into a good being, or ſin ſtill remaineth in the temper of the devil, and it is *not* "true in *event* and *fact*, that SIN is totally deſtroyed, by a reduction of *all men* under *moral ſubjection* to God," "and it ought (upon his own principles) to be fairly and honeſtly owned (by *him*) that Chriſt has not *bruiſed the ſerpent's head*, as it is declared that he ſhould." What means our author by ſaying the *devil*, that is, his *kingdom*? Is the *devil* and his *kingdom* one and the ſame, ſo that

the

the deſtruction of the latter is the deſtruction of the former? Then indeed, he who deſtroys the *building*, deſtroys the *builder*.

But our author ſeems to think, that if the human race are *all ſaved*, then the devil's kingdom will be deſtroyed. He hath herein overlookt certain truths of no ſmall importance in the preſent caſe. Sin did not *firſt* begin, when *Adam* fell in paradiſe; but in the bliſsful regions, when the angels deviated from their *firſt ſtate* of integrity and holineſs, and for their thus ſinning were caſt down to hell. One of theſe fallen angels, for ſome ſpecial reaſon, is ſtiled the *devil* and diſtinguiſhed from *his* angels; and probably is the ſame active and leading agent in wickedneſs that is meant by *Beelzebub* the prince of devils. While the *devil* and *his* angels remain at enmity with God, retaining their character as *rebels* againſt him, *ſin* and *luſt* ſtill reign. If then, the *being* of the devil is to be ſpared; and yet, *ſin*, that work of the devil, muſt, according to the firſt promiſe, be *totally* and *abſolutely* deſtroyed, by him who was born of a woman; the words in Geneſis are a promiſe of ſalvation to the *devil* and *his* angels, no leſs than to *Adam* and *his* poſterity. But that this promiſe of ſalvation to them, ſhould come in while the Deity was pronouncing a curſe upon the ſerpent, *appears to me impoſſible!*

Another text from the ſame writer, and the laſt which the extractor brings to view, is recorded in Revelation 5. 13. *And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and ſuch as are in the ſea, and all that are in them, heard I ſaying, bleſſing and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb for ever and ever.* The interpretation given to this paſſage, is farther from the truth,

by

by ſome hundreds of years, than from the preſent moment to the end of time; and had our extractor conſidered it duly, he would, for his own credit, have concealed it *from* inſtead of *bringing* it *to* view. It hath no manner of relation to tranſactions *beyond* the day of judgment; it is a figurative repreſentation preſented to *John* in viſion, before the Lamb opened any one of the ſeals, of that book wherein was written the future condition of the church at different periods. The general opinion is, that *John* was baniſhed to the iſle of *Patmos* in the reign of *Domitian* about the year 96; ſome place it earlier, none later. The period connected with the opening of the firſt ſeal is thought by Dr. *Newton*, biſhop of *Briſtol*, to have terminated with the life of the emperor *Nerva* A. D. 98. He ſuppoſeth, that the baniſhment of *John* happened under *Nero*'s perſecution; and that the period commenced with *Veſpaſian* and *Titus* in 70, when *Jeruſalem* was deſtroyed. Mr. *Lowman* reckons, that the period ended with the firſt century. Dr. *Iſaac Chauncy*, eldeſt ſon of a former preſident of *Harvard* College, and paſtor of a church in *London*, in a manuſcript work upon the Revelation, wrote about ninety years ſince, in my poſſeſſion, interprets the *white horſe*, which appeared upon the opening of the firſt ſeal, as expreſſive of that ſtate of peace and tranquility which the churches enjoyed ſoon after *John*'s having the viſion, which he places in the reign of *Domitian*. He thinks that the period from the opening of the firſt ſeal began about 98, and laſted till the third perſecution under *Trajan*. I know not of any who bring the opening of the firſt ſeal ſo low down as the year of our Lord 100. The laſt paſſage therefore which the extractor gives us, inſtead of relating to a tranſaction to take place (no body can imagine *when*, upon the ſcheme of the pamphlet)

pamphlet) after the day of judgment, *preceded* an event that exiſted near upon ſeventeen hundred years ago.

The extractor having given us from a *number* of writers, (*two only*) ſome *few* (doubtleſs the *moſt weighty*) of the many texts mentioned by them in favour of *Salvation for all men*, exhibits a *like extract* from what they and others have offered in anſwer to the objections brought againſt the doctrine.

The firſt he brings forward is Dr. *Joſeph Nicol Scott*; for after he quitted the miniſtry, he was a Doctor of Phyſick.

The Dr. hath certainly been trepanned into the ſupport of a ſcheme, to which he was oppoſed. I ſhall ſtate the caſe to the reader, and leave him to follow it with his own remarks. The Dr. indeed preached and publiſhed againſt the *proper eternity* of hell torments; but in the ſame diſcourſes from whence the quotations are made, he argues that—— "a *great part* of the texts which the ſcripture-writers make uſe of, whereby to expreſs future puniſhment, as to *die*, to be *deſtroyed*, to *reap corruption*, to *burn up*, to *conſume*, when applied to the *perſons* of men, are ſo far from implying a *perpetual continuance* of their *life*, that, on the contrary, theſe terms (if literally underſtood) ſuppoſe, that a *period* will be *put* to it. And ſhould this *death*, or *deſtruction* be ſo circumſtanced, as not to admit of any *after reſtoration*, it may, for that reaſon, be ſtyled an *everlaſting deſtruction*; and the means by which it is performed, an *everlaſting* or *eternal fire*. And, if this *death* or *deſtruction*, be adminiſtred by way of *puniſhment*, for the ſame reaſon, that the *death* or *deſtruction* are ſaid to be *eternal*, ſo alſo may the *puniſhment*. When it is *affirmed*, that the *reprobate* ſhall *die*, ſhall *reap corruption*, ſhall *be burnt*

burnt up; and when the ideas of *life*, *incorruptibility*, *indiſſolubility*, are conſtantly reſtrained to the *good* and *virtuous* part of mankind, as their *peculiar prerogative*, will it not follow from hence, that to *affirm* the *wicked* to be *continued for ever alive*, though in a ſtate of *miſerable ſenſation*, is not only to *affirm* that which is not *affirmed* in *ſcripture*, but which in reality, *contradicts* it, and renders the *ſcripture-account* of things inconſiſtent with itſelf? I add, that, how true ſoever it is, that the *common cataſtrophe* belongs to *all the wicked*, that they ſhall be *deſtroyed*, or, to ſpeak in the *ſcripture ſtyle*, that *the ſoul, which ſins*, it ſhall *die*: yet this *death* or *deſtruction*, may admit of different *degrees* of *miſery*, in proportion to the different *degrees* of *guilt*."

"The *ſtrict* and *proper* ſenſe of the *ſcripture threatning* conveys the idea of a *true* and *proper* death. *Fire* is a *deſtructive element*, and has a tendency to *conſume the bodies* that are *caſt* into it; both the *nature* of it and the *ſcripture account* oblige us to infer, that the *wicked* ſhall be *conſumed* and *burnt up* in it."

In the cloſe of the ſecond ſermon on the ſubject of *future miſery*, the Dr. addreſſes the ſinner thus, "Canſt thou, in *cool reflection reconcile* thyſelf to the *thought* of being *condemned* by that *all-righteous Judge*, and, by his *impartial ſentence*, not only excluded from the *future happineſs*, but alſo conſigned over to *deſtruction*, a *deſtruction* which (by ſuppoſition) will not be *reverſed*, an *everlaſting deſtruction from the preſence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power*? Is thy paſſion of *fear uncapable* of being moved by a *deſtruction* ſo circumſtanced as this? And where, beſides that circumſtance of *diſſolution*, which belongs to all *bad* men in common, each is given to underſtand, that this *death* will be executed upon *him*, with that *degree of ſuffering*, which is proportioned to his *crimes*."

However

However erroneous the Doctor's ſentiments reſpecting future miſery and other matters might be deemed by many who had a perſonal knowledge of him; yet his integrity, was unimpeached; and he cannot be ſuppoſed to have ſaid as above, if he favoured or held with the doctrine of *Salvation for all men*; for his reaſoning is deſigned to prove, that the wicked will be ſo *fully* deſtroyed, as after a certain period to have no *further* exiſtence.

Notwithſtanding the Doctor aſſerts, that "the term ſo commonly tranſlated *eternal, everlaſting, for ever and ever*, does not from any force of the word, imply what we mean by a *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity; the original words, both in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, ſignify nothing more than an age, and in the plural *ages*, either *longer* or *ſhorter, definite* or *indefinite*;" yet, from the above quotations, one would be ready to imagine, he had *ſome doubts*, whether or no, a *ſtrict* and *proper eternity* was not intended, when the puniſhment and deſtruction of the wicked and the means of effecting it are ſpoken of; or why doth he ſay, "if the *deſtruction* admits not of any *after reſtoration* it may be ſtyled *an everlaſting deſtruction* and the means by which it is performed an *everlaſting* or *eternal* fire—and that, if the deſtruction is adminiſtred by way of *puniſhment*, for the ſame reaſon, that the death or deſtruction are ſaid to be *eternal*, ſo alſo may the *puniſhment*?" Why doth the Dr. thus attempt to prove, that there is a ſenſe in which the term *eternal*, or *everlaſting*, when applied to the deſtruction and puniſhment of the wicked and the fire of hell, may intend a *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity, ſo be that the original doth not mean it in the places alluded to? Doth not this amount almoſt to a yielding up the point in diſpute?

But

But to examine the aſſertion reſpecting the term, both in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, tranſlated *eternal*, *everlaſting*, *for ever and ever*; beginning with the *Hebrew gnolam*, frequently printed in the *European* publications *olam*. Dr. *Taylor*, who was intimate with Dr. *Scott*, and publiſhed his concordance many years after the ſermons of the latter were printed, expreſſes the ſame ſentiment on the word *gnolam*, roundly declaring, "It ſignifieth *eternity* not from the proper force of the word, but when the ſenſe of the place, or the nature of the ſubject, to which it is applied requireth it; as God and his attributes." If this is a *juſt* remark, it holds good in a much higher degree with reference to all the other *Hebrew* terms* tranſlated *everlaſting* or *eternal*; ſo that of conſequence there is not an *Hebrew* word in the old teſtament, that in its ſtrict and proper ſenſe ſignifies *eternity* or *eternal*—which may be deemed a moſt extraordinary circumſtance in a *divine* revelation

* The other *Hebrew* words are *tamidh*, *kedhem*, *netzahh*, and *gnadh*.

Tamidh occurs one hundred and one times; but though tranſlated *always*, *continually*, *perpetual*, *ever* and *evermore*, doth not even *once* include the idea of *proper* eternity.

The true meaning of *kedhem* is *antiquity*; you meet with it forty and three times. In Deut. 33. 27. it is rendered *eternal*, the *eternal* God, inſtead of the God of *antiquity*. In Pſ. 55. 19. *of old*, he that abideth *of old*: ſo in Micah 5. 2. whoſe goings forth have been from *of old*. In Hab. 1. 12. *everlaſting*, art thou not from *everlaſting*? In Pro. 8. 23. in the plural *ever*, or *ever* the earth was.

Netzahh out of forty five times is often tranſlated for *ever*: but does not neceſſarily imply *proper* eternity more than twice or thrice, unleſs we include thoſe places, where if that interpretation is allowed the ſcheme of *Univerſal Salvation* muſt be of courſe demoliſhed; and thoſe alſo wherein it is aſked "wilt thou forget me for *ever*? wilt thou be angry for *ever*? wilt thou hide thyſelf for *ever*?" and the like. It is not once joined with any name of God to expreſs his *eternity*.

Gnadh

of that magnitude, and whoſe ſubject matter, in places, is ſo peculiar as to require it. But poſſibly the candid reader, after having weighed what is to be offered, may be ready to pronounce both the Doctors greatly miſtaken, and to believe, that the fact is, that the *true* and *proper* force of the word *gnolam*, is, *eternity* or *perpetuity*, but that like the word *eternal* in *Engliſh* it is, on occaſion, uſed *figuratively* to expreſs a *longer* or *ſhorter*, a *definite* or *indefinite* duration, which is to be determined by the ſenſe of the place, and the nature of the ſubject to which it is applied.

Gnolam is to be met with for the firſt time in Gen. 3. 22. In that, and the following verſe, the Lord God propoſes to ſend *Adam* (now that he hath fallen and is become mortal) forth from the garden of *Eden*, "leſt he put forth his hand, and take of the tree of life and eat, and live for *ever*"—hope and expect to live for *ever*. *Gnolam*, cannot here mean an *age*: for, as yet *no age* had run out: and beſides *Adam* was not to live *it*; whereas he lived an *age* longer than any man elſe,

Gnadh as a noun occurs twenty and eight times. Dr. *Taylor* would not admit, that, in Iſ. 9. 6. (in the original *the father of eternity*, tranſlated *the everlaſting father*) it means *proper* eternity a parte ante if applied to the Lord Jeſus; and then there are only ſix places where it muſt be underſtood of *proper* eternity. It is joined with *gnolam* eighteen times, and once with the plural *gnolmee*: thrice it precedes *gnolam*, but follows it fifteen times, and *gnolmee* once. According to *Aben Ezra*, when following *gnolam*, it ſerves only as a prepoſition and refers to the word *gnolam* ſunk by an ellipſis; ſo that *legnolam vegnadh* is a conciſe mode of ſpeech or writing for *legnolam vegnadh gnolam*. This remark of *Aben Ezra* appears juſt, as the abbreviation is moſtly in the *Hebrew* poeſy (whoſe metre might require it) the ſong of *Moſes* after the deſtruction of *Pharaoh*, and the Pſalms. Whether *gnadee* Num. 24. 20, 24. is to be conſidered as the plural of the noun or as a prepoſition is hard to determine. *Balaam*, inſtead of ſaying of *Amalek* or *Eber*, he ſhall periſh for *ever*, might only ſay, he ſhall periſh *until* or *onward*, and there ſtop, leaving imagination to fill up the blank.

elſe, ſhould you deduct from thoſe antediluvians who were *born* into the world, only fifty years for their *minority*, It is evidently contrafted to *death* or *mortality*, and threfore neceſſarily includes *immortality* or *perpetuity*; and ſignifies expreſsly the ſame with our tranſlation. This we may pronounce the *original* ſignification of the *Hebrew* term. And ſuch a ſenſe well agrees with the root from which it is derived, meaning to be *hid*, *concealed* or *ſecret*: for moſt aſſuredly nothing is more *hid*, *concealed*, or *ſecret*, with regard to *finite* beings, than *eternity*—the *eternal* God only excepted. Eternity, properly conſidered, is *that only which is concealed* from the underſtandings of men and angels, and viewed by the divine mind alone. Whether *Hebrew* was the language of *Eden* or not, *Moſes* without doubt did expreſs the truth in the moſt proper and ſignificant terms.

In ſupport of what has been now advanced, let it be noted, that *gnolam* is uſed as an epithet whereby to characterize the *true* God, and to diſtinguiſh him from the falſe gods of idolaters. Some of the names by which He was ſpoken of, as *El*, *Elohim*, *Elohee*, were given alſo to falſe deities and idols; and therefore the term *gnolam* is once and again added when the *true* God is intended, in order to *mark* him out by it; and the attribute, by that term aſcribed to him, is conſidered as being ſufficiently deſcriptive, and what no other gods could pretend to, their origin being of late date: But if the word *gnolam*, by its own *proper force*, doth not expreſs that attribute, on the contrary gains that *ſpecial* meaning from its connexion, how can the application of it, to a name of God *common* to falſe gods, *deſcribe* the true God? The epithet in that caſe does not deſcribe the *ſubject*, but the ſubject the *epithet*; which is contrary to the very *deſign* of epithets. When indeed the *proper* meaning of an epithet expreſſes more

than

than *can* belong to the ſubject, then the nature of the ſubject obliges us to underſtand it *figuratively*: but this is widely different from its *gaining* a meaning *infinitely* beyond what is *proper* to it, by being joined to a name of deity *not peculiar* to the true God, and therefore *not* neceſſarily implying any thing infinite or eternal in it. Let it alſo be obſerved, that the *proper force* of a word may at length vary. The word may obtain through cuſtom and common conſent a ſignification widely different from what it had when firſt uſed: *knave* and *villain* are inſtances, each had formerly a good meaning, it is now the reverſe. The uſe to be made of the obſervation is, that could it be proved that the *original* ſignification of *gnolam* was not *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity, contrary to the evidence above produced; yet it is plain from the manner in which it is uſed, in order to *mark* out the *true* God, that it acquired and poſſeſſed this as its *true* and *proper* ſenſe, when the ſacred oracles of the old teſtament were written.

But to advert to the paſſages wherein it is uſed for *eternity* or to *mark* out the *eternity* of God, and ſo to *diſtinguiſh* the *true* from every *falſe* god; after having noted, that the *Hebrew* language through want of *adjectives* often makes uſe of a *noun*; thus *gnolam* ſignifying *eternity*, is uſed for *eternal* or *everlaſting* in manner following, the god of eternity, for the everlaſting or eternal God; in many places it is tranſlated by *ever* or *evermore*. JEHOVAH, one of the *peculiar* names of the true God, is ſynonymous with the *everlaſting God*; and hence *Abraham* is ſaid to have called upon the name of JEHOVAH *the everlaſting God*;* and *the everlaſting God* JEHOVAH, the creator of the ends of the earth is ſaid not to faint or be weary.† We read, "Thou O JEHOVAH, remaineſt for *ever*;‡ Thou,

* Gen. 21. 33. † Iſ. 40. 28. ‡ Lam. 5. 19.

Thou, JEHOVAH, art moſt High for *evermore*:* Thou art from *everlaſting*," † and that JEHOVAH ſhall endure *for ever*. ‡ JEHOVAH, though not named, is intended by him that liveth for *ever* in *Daniel* (12 ch. 7 v.) When He himſelf lifteth up his hand to heaven and ſweareth, the form of the oath is "I live for *ever*." ‖ In order to expreſs particularly his exiſtence from eternity to eternity it is ſaid, even from *everlaſting* to *everlaſting* thou art God. § Inſtead of *for ever and ever*, as in our tranſlation (1 Chro. 16. 36—29. 10.) it ſhould be, according to the original, and as tranſlated elſewhere (Pſ. 41. 13—106. 48.) "bleſſed be the Lord God of Iſrael *from everlaſting to everlaſting*."

We muſt underſtand the term *gnolam* in various other places as meaning *eternity*; thus when we read, that Jehovah ſitteth king for *ever*; that his counſel ſtandeth for *ever*; that his glory ſhall endure for *ever*; that his mercy endureth for *ever*, or is *everlaſting*; that his truth endureth for *ever*; that his name endureth for *ever*, and is from *everlaſting*; that he keepeth truth for *ever*, reigneth for *ever* and is an *everlaſting* king. According to *Aben Ezra*, as obſerved in a preceding note, it is meant to be repeated, in order to heighten the expreſſion, and is moſt juſtly rendered for *ever* and *ever*.

In the *Chaldee* dialect it retains the ſame meaning. *Daniel* cries out, "bleſſed be the name of God from *everlaſting* to *everlaſting*." ¶ *Nebuchadnezzar* in his imperial proclamation to all people, nations and languages, declares God's kingdom to be an *everlaſting* kingdom, that his dominion is an *everlaſting* dominion, and that He liveth for *ever*. † When *Daniel*'s viſion was explained to him, it was ſaid of the moſt High, that his kingdom is an *everlaſting* kingdom ††

Applied

* Pſ. 92. 8. †—93. 2. ‡—9. 7.—102. 12. ‖ Deut. 32. 40.
§ Pſ. 90. 2. ¶ Dan. 2. 20. †—4. 3, 34. ††—7. 27.

Applied figuratively to thoſe ſubjects that neceſſarily exclude *eternity*, it frequently anſwers to the *Engliſh* terms *ever* and *alway* when uſed in a relaxed ſenſe. Thus the *Hebrew* ſervant who had his ear bored was to ſerve his maſter *for ever*;* and the *Jews* were to obſerve certain ordinances and ſtatutes for *ever*; † as long as poſſible, whilſt the ſervants ability and the Moſaic diſpenſation continued. But that *gnolam* when thus uſed doth not properly mean *the age of man* or a *century* (which are expreſſed by other words) is evident from the phraſes, *throughout your generations by an ordinance for ever*, and *it ſhall be a ſtatute for ever throughout your generations*. ‡

We read, "notwithſtanding the cities of the Levites may the Levites redeem *at any time*," ‖ in the original *gnolam*, and the text is *literally* "the redemption-right ſhall be *ever* or *perpetually* to the Levites," to be exerciſed at pleaſure. When the Pſalmiſt ſaith, "I have inclined my heart to perform thy ſtatutes *alway*," § he means as long as poſſible. But when *Job* ſaith, "I would not live alway," ** the word might be rendered *eternally*: and what man of a ſimilar character with *Job* would not loath *immortality* in the preſent body and world? The word might alſo have been rendered *eternally* in that paſſage, "and Jehovah ſaid, my ſpirit ſhall not alway ſtrive with man." ††

Gnolam

* Ex. 21. 6. †——12. 14.—27. 21, and many other places. ‡ Ex. 12. 14. Lev. 10. 9. ‖ Lev. 25. 32. § Pſ. 119. 112.

** Job 7. 16. †† Gen. 6. 3. The original *Jehovah* has been given in ſeveral quotations, inſtead of the *Engliſh* Lord, which laſt term relates to *dominion*, whereas *Jehovah* expreſſes *abſolute exiſtence*. Here I cannot omit mentioning my earneſt wiſh, that whenever another *American* edition of the bible is printed, it might be recommended by Congreſs, that *Jehovah* ſhould be retained in the *Engliſh* tranſlation wherever found in the Original.

Gnolam may or muſt have the force of *eternity* in more than one hundred and twenty, out of four hundred and twenty eight times that it occurs in the ſingular number. It is deſigned more than fifty times to expreſs the continuance, of the covenant with *Noah* relative to the world's not being again drowned——of the covenant with *Abraham* and his ſeed——of the covenant with the Jewiſh nation——and of thoſe ſtatutes ordinances and ſo on, which were to be obſerved by that people while the Moſaic diſpenſation laſted. In other places it intends a longer or ſhorter duration, and hath a ſenſe given it in the tranſlation ſuited to the connexion. It occurs in the plural number only nine times in the *Chaldee* and twelve in the *Hebrew* :* but it is plain that the ſenſe is moſtly ſunk by means of it, to undefined periods of duration inſtead of expreſſing eternity; in like manner as *gods* mean leſs than *God*, for *though there be gods many and lords many, to us there is but one God, and one Lord.*

Notwithſtanding

* It is plural in the *Chaldee* when it is ſaid, "O king live for *ever*" (Dan. 2. 4—3. 9—5. 10—6. 6, 21.)—that, the God of heaven ſhall ſet up a kingdom, which ſhall not be *ever* deſtroyed, but ſhall ſtand for *ever* (Dan. 2. 44 twice)—that the God of Daniel is the living God and ſtedfaſt for *ever* (6. 26.) that the ſaints ſhall poſſeſs the kingdom for ever, even for ever and *ever* (7. 18.)

It is plural in the *Hebrew* when it is ſaid, "I have ſurely built thee a ſettled place to abide in for *ever*" (1 Kings 8. 13. 2 Chro. 6. 2.) "I will abide in thy tabernacle for *ever*" (Pſ. 61. 4.) "I have conſidered the years of *ancient times*. Will the Lord caſt off for *ever?*" (Pſ. 77. 5, 7.) "Thy kingdom is an *everlaſting* kingdom" (Pſ. 145. 13. where the plural has the *Hebrew* for *all* before it) "It hath been already of *old time*" (Eccl. 1. 10.) "In the Lord Jehovah is *everlaſting* ſtrength" (Iſ. 26. 4.) "Iſrael ſhall be ſaved with an *everlaſting* ſalvation, ye ſhall not be confounded *world without end*" (Iſ. 45. 17. twice) "Awake O ſword of the Lord as in the generations *of old*" (Iſ. 51. 9.) "Seventy weeks are determined to bring in *everlaſting* righteouſneſs" (Dan. 9. 24.)

Notwithſtanding the number of places, in which *gnolam* muſt, from the nature of the ſubjects to which it is joined, ſignify *limited periods of duration*, is greater than where it means *eternity*; yet it is apprehended, that, if the impartial enquirer after truth attends duly to what hath been above advanced, he will be convinced, that the *original* and *continued* literal import of the term is *ſtrict* and *proper eternity*, and that wherever it doth not expreſs *this*, it is uſed *figuratively*.

Let us now ſee by what words *gnolam* is tranſlated in the *Greek*. The *Greek* tranſlation of the bible is ſuppoſed to have been made at *Alexandria* about two hundred and eighty four years before the birth of Chriſt, by ſeventy two of the moſt learned Jews, who were the beſt ſkilled in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* languages: for brevity they are uſually called the Seventy, and the tranſlation from them the ſeptuagint. The *Hebrew* term is always (half a ſcore times only excepted) rendered, by the *Greek* noun *aion*, or the adjective *aionios* formed out of it—by the noun full as many again as by the adjective. The plural of the noun does not occur ſo often in the ſeptuagint, as the plural of *gnolam* in the *Hebrew*. In fourteen places the adjective is plural being joined to nouns that are plural, as generations, doors, paths, waſtes, hills, ways and places. The Seventy, as they muſt have attended to *ſenſe* and not to *ſound*, were of courſe led to uſe the moſt expreſſive word or words in the *Greek*, as oft as *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity was meant in the original; and yet, though there is no denying that the *Hebrew* in numerous places intends *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity, not more than a ſingle inſtance offers wherein they uſe any other term than *aion* or *aionios*: that inſtance is in Deut 33. 27. where mention is made of the *everlaſting* arms of the eternal God, which they render

render by a word that ſignifies *always flowing* and ſo *perpetual*. The natural inference is that the Seventy were of opinion that *aion* and *aionios* fully expreſſed *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity, and that neither any other ſingle word nor any periphraſis was wanting in the caſe. It is not ſtrange, that they were of this opinion, when it is recollected that *Ariſtotle* tells us that *aion* is derived from two words that mean *always exiſting*. The etymology is perfectly eaſy, and does not labour as often happens in matters of that kind, and is ſomewhat countenanced by the uſe that *Homer* made, five hundred and ſixty years before, of the ſame words, only altering the laſt into the plural number, when ſpeaking of his *immortal* gods.

Ariſtotle flouriſhed only ſixty years before the Septuagint tranſlation was made, and died within thirty eight of it; ſo that the Seventy might be fully informed of his ſentiment. His own abilities, and having been tutor to *Alexander* the great; gave him an extenſive character; and men of letters were obliged, for their own credit, to ſeek after and conſult his writings.

Alexander's conqueſts ſpread the *Greek* language, and it became common. Of courſe, vaſt numbers, eſpecially of the diſperſed *Jews* being better acquainted with the *Greek* than the *Hebrew*, the Septuagint came into general uſe, both privately and in their ſynagogues; and ſo continued, until and long after the days of our Saviour and his apoſtles, when it was evidently in high eſteem. Our Lord's words in Matt. 15. 9. "in vain do they worſhip me teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," are the ſame with the ſeptuagint in Iſ. 29. 13. and *might be* (tho' it becomes me not to ſay *were*) quoted by *Matthew* from that tranſlation. The Eunuch we muſt ſuppoſe uſed the ſeptuagint, for the words of the prophet Iſaiah (53. 7, 8.) which we are told (Acts 8. 32, 33) he read, are

literally

iterally the ſame with it. The evangeliſts and apoſtles are thought to have followed it often. *Peter* in his addreſs to the men of *Iſrael* quotes the Patriarch *David* ſpeaking concerning the Meſſiah (Acts 2. 25, 26, 27, 28) which is given us in the words of the *Greek* tranſlation, ſomething different from the *Hebrew*, though the ſenſe is much the ſame. From the regard thus ſhewn to the Septuagint, it may be fairly concluded, that *aion* and *aionios* continued to retain the ſenſe in which they were firſt uſed by the Seventy as expreſſive of *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity; and in confirmation of their ſtill anſwering to the *Hebrew gnolam* let it be noted, that the *Syriac* verſion of the New Teſtament, which was made in the moſt early times, uniformly renders them by the ſame term *gnolam*.

Now let us ſearch the New Teſtament for the ſenſe of *aion* and *aionios*. "The reader may, if he pleaſe, look into the *Greek concordance*, and he will there find," that *aion* is to be met with thirty and three times in the Evangeliſts, and *aionios* thirty. And are we to underſtand an *eternity* as implied or intended, when our Lord ſaid (to the fig-tree) let no man eat fruit of thee hereafter for *ever*—he that ſhall blaſpheme againſt the holy Ghoſt hath not forgiveneſs for *ever*—whoſoever drinketh of the water I ſhall give him, ſhall not thirſt for *ever*—if any man eat of the bread which came down from heaven, he ſhall live for *ever*; he that eateth of this bread ſhall live for *ever*—if a man keep my ſaying he ſhall not ſee death for *ever*—they ſhall not periſh for *ever*, neither ſhall any pluck them out of my hand—whoſoever believeth in me ſhall not die for *ever*"——then the noun *aion* was rarely uſed by our Saviour in any other ſenſe than as meaning *eternity*, unleſs when confined to a different one by an adnoun or the ſubject he is

treating

treating upon. I have not added his words, "the ſervant abideth not in the houſe for *ever*, but the ſon abideth *ever*: and he ſhall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for *ever*: and lo I am with you alway unto the end of *the world*;" as it might be diſputed, whether more than a certain meaſure of time was intended in *any* of theſe places. The meaning of the word is limited when he ſaith, "it ſhall not be forgiven in *this* world—the cares of *this* world—the harveſt is *the end* of the *world*—ſo ſhall it be in the end of *this* world—the children of *this* world." There is no miſtaking him when he ſaith, "in the *world to come*, eternal or everlaſting life; and *that* world," in oppoſition to *this* world. In cloſing that pattern of prayer he gave to his diſciples, commonly called the Lord's prayer, he uſes the word in the plural number, "thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory for *ever*:" ſo did *Gabriel*, when it was told the Virgin "he, i. e. Jeſus, ſhould reign over the houſe of *Jacob* for *ever*. *Mary* uſed it in the ſingular, ſaying, "he hath holpen his ſervant *Iſrael* in remembrance of his mercy for *ever*:" and ſo did *Zacharias* when he mentions the holy prophets which had been *ſince the world began*; and *Peter* when he raſhly told our Saviour, "thou ſhalt not waſh my feet for *ever*;" and the man cured of his blindneſs when he confounded the Jewiſh Sanhedrim by declaring, "*ſince the world began* it was not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind." It matters not whether the Jews intended *proper* eternity, when they took notice of their having heard out of the law that Chriſt abideth for *ever*. But when they ſaid, "now we know that thou haſt a devil; *Abraham* is dead and the prophets; and thou ſayeſt, if a man keep my ſaying he ſhall not taſte of death for *ever*;" it is plain that they referred to and underſtood our

Lord

Lord as intending a continued perpetual exiſtence, or *immortality*; and it muſt be conceded, that the noun *aion*, as commonly uſed by our Saviour without an adnoun or ſpecial ſubject to confine its meaning, doth contain in general the idea of perpetuity, or *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity.

Let us in like manner try the meaning of *aionios*. When the young ruler inquired "good maſter, what ſhall I do that I may inherit *eternal life*?—When the lawyer meant to try our Lord's ſkill in divinity by the ſame queſtion—When our Lord told *Nicodemus*, that whoſoever believeth in the ſon ſhould have *everlaſting* life; and *John* the baptiſt declared the ſame to his diſciples—When the woman of *Samaria* was informed that the water which Chriſt had to give, would be a well of water ſpringing up into *everlaſting life*—When the Jews were directed to labour for the meat which endureth unto *everlaſting life*; and were told, whoſo eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood hath *eternal life*—When *Peter* ſaid to our Lord, thou haſt the words of *eternal life*—When Chriſt tells us, that he gives unto his ſheep *eternal life*; and ſpeaking of the Father's commandment to publiſh the goſpel, ſays, and I know that his commandment is *life everlaſting*—When he ſays, "thou haſt given him power over all fleſh, that he ſhould give *eternal life* to as many as thou haſt given him; and this is *life eternal* (in the principle and will terminate in it) that they might know thee the only true God and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent"—can any other be intended by *eternal life* than a *glorious immortality*? The adjective *aionios* is joined to *life* twenty five times, by Chriſt himſelf nineteen, out of the thirty, and in all theſe places means *eternal* as including *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity, not to inſiſt upon *everlaſting* habitations (in Luke 16. 9.) And yet, if we

will

will give up our judgments to the diſpoſal of certain interpreters, in the four others, when joined by our Lord to *fire*, *puniſhment* and *damnation*, we are to believe it means nothing more than a *temporary* duration, the *real length* of which ſcarce one of them will undertake to tell us. Such interpretations in direct violation of the general meaning of ſcriptural words are calculated to promote deiſm, rather than chriſtianity. When revelation is ſo treated by its friends, no wonder that it is ſpurned by its enemies.

The phraſe of *eternal* or *everlaſting* life is to be found in the Acts and Epiſtles nineteen times, in ſixteen of which it alſo means a *glorious immortality*; another indeed might be added, for when *John* writes "ye know that no murderer hath *eternal life* abiding in him," he thereby deſigns that lively faith and holy obedience with which a *glorious immortality* is connected as the end thereof. The ſame apoſtle in two other places intends by it Jeſus Chriſt.

The adjective *aionias* is uſed twenty and two times more in the Acts and Epiſtles; four times in the plural, and eighteen in the ſingular number. In the plural by *Paul* when he writes of the myſtery, which was kept ſecret *ſince the world began*; of the grace which was given in Chriſt Jeſus before *the world began*; and of that eternal life which God promiſed before *the world began*. As our cauſe is not ſtraitened for evidence, let it be admitted, that the idea of eternity does not enter into any of theſe paſſages. But when he ſaith, "the things which are not ſeen are *eternal*," the connexion and the apoſtolic character oblige us to maintain, that *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity is intended; for theſe things which are not ſeen are oppoſed to thoſe that are *temporal*—*temporary* would have been a better word, as expreſſive of their inſignificant

nificant duration. It was alſo beneath the dignity of the great apoſtle of the Gentiles, to look, in the ſenſe he meant, at things which had a duration ſhort of eternity. As in this paſſage, he refers to a *proper* eternity, we muſt conclude he does the ſame in that which immediately precedes, when he ſpeaks of an *eternal* weight of glory, and in that which follows, wherein we read of an houſe not made with hands *eternal* in the heavens. It is moſt reaſonable to believe the like, when he writes of God's having given *everlaſting* conſolation—when he aſcribes to the King of kings and Lord of lords honour and power *everlaſting* —when he mentions, the ſalvation which is in Chriſt Jeſus with *eternal* glory; Chriſt's becoming the author of *eternal* ſalvation unto all them that obey him; the doctrine of *eternal* judgment; Chriſt's having obtained *eternal* redemption, and his having offered up himſelf through the *eternal* Spirit; the promiſe of the *eternal* inheritance, which they that are called receive; and the blood of the *everlaſting* covenant. Thus alſo when he ſpeaks of the commandment of the *everlaſting* God: by which epithet he means rather to mark out the true God by the attribute alluded to; than to expreſs that the true God poſſeſſed that attribute. But it is a falſe aſſertion, that "did we not know, before hand, that eternity was an eſſential attribute of God, it could never be argued from the application of this word to him." Indeed did we know, before hand, that it was *not* an eſſential attribute of God, it could never be argued that it was, from the application of this word to him: but the application of words may and do convince of thoſe truths reſpecting God, which we neither did nor could know before hand, as every one muſt allow who believes chriſtianity: for till words convinced us we

knew

knew not, before hand, the love of God in providing a Saviour, nor the exceeding riches of his grace in pardoning the greateſt of ſinners. But to return from this digreſſion; and admit that the apoſtle is not to be underſtood as meaning *proper* eternity, when he writes to *Philemon*. "perhaps *Oneſimus* departed for a ſeaſon, that thou ſhouldſt receive him for *ever*:" however, methinks it is offering an amazing violence to his writings, and taking an unwarrantable liberty with them, to ſay, that, becauſe, in this laſt mentioned place and three others, he might not mean *proper* eternity, therefore he could not mean it, when he makes mention of *everlaſting* deſtruction, though in thirteen other places he uſes the term to mark out a *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity. *Peter* ſpeaks of *eternal* glory, and of the *everlaſting* kingdom of our Lord and may be allowed to intend a *proper* eternity: but *Jude* is not to meet with the like indulgence when he talks of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* and the cities about them, ſuffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire, though it ſhould be obſerved, that by cities we are not to underſtand the buildings but the citizens, as is evident from our Lord's declaring, that it ſhould be more tolerable for *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, in the day of judgment, than for that city which would not hear the apoſtles. As the *everlaſting* goſpel in the Revelation may poſſibly be ſo ſtiled in a *figurative* ſenſe, we ſhall not employ it in our argument. It may ſuffice, that the adjective *aionios* is to be underſtood fifteen times out of the twenty two, as referring to *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity.

It appears from the preceding paragraphs, that the adjective *aionios* is joined to *life*, one and forty times in the New Teſtament, and as often includes *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity, being uſed with that noun

to

to expreſs a *glorious immortality*. What a *paltry* quotation is that then! "the *bare force* of the word will not ſupport us, in maintaining an *endleſs duration* with reſpect, either to the *happineſs* of the righteous, or the puniſhment of the wicked. We know the *righteous* ſhall be *happy for ever*. And why! becauſe they are ſaid, in other texts of ſcripture to be *incorruptible*, *indiſſoluble*, *immortal*, *not* to die *any more*, and the like." Yes; and we ſhould know it from the numerous declarations made of their being to enjoy *eternal life*, and the like, were the other texts of ſcripture wanting: for the enjoyment of *eternal life*, *eternal ſalvation*, and an *eternal weight of glory*, as neceſſarily implies *immortality*, as life does being. The original ſignifying *indiſſoluble*, and tranſlated *endleſs*, is to be found *only* in Heb. 7. 16. and has no direct reference whatever to the righteous; but relates to Chriſt alone, who is ſaid to be made a prieſt not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after or according to the power of an *endleſs life*. It is a vain pretence of ſome, that the *endleſs life* intends that of believers, which Chriſt by virtue of his prieſtly office confers upon them: "for as Dr. *Owen* well obſerves, the compariſon and oppoſition that is made between *the law of a carnal commandment*, whereby *Aaron* was conſtituted a prieſt, and *the power of an endleſs life*, whereby Chriſt was made ſo, do evidence that the making of Chriſt *ſuch a prieſt* as he is, was the *effect* of *this endleſs life*: but how can Chriſt be *made a prieſt* according to the power of that *endleſs life* which by *virtue of his prieſtly office* he confers on others?" Such pretence makes the *effect* productive of the *cauſe*, and then the *cauſe* productive of the *effect*; and forms as complete a circle as ever was travelled by a Popiſh diſputant. Our Saviour ſaith, "this is the bread which cometh down

from

from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and *not die* (John 6. 50.) and below (v. 58) he that eateth of this bread ſhall *live for ever*, where *aion* is uſed. Can the words, *and not die* mean more, or are they more expreſſive, than the words *ſhall live for ever*? In anſwering the objection of the Sadducees regarding the reſurrection, he tells them, that they which ſhall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the reſurrection from the dead (he means a bleſſed reſurrection becauſe it is connected with worthineſs) neither marry nor are given in marriage, *neither can they die any more* (Luke 20. 36.) but their immortality is no more ſecured by that mode of expreſſion, than if it had been, *they ſhall live for ever*: it indeed leads to this thought, that, as they *can die no more*, there is no occaſion for marriage to ſupply the loſſes that death would occaſion. We read alſo (Rev. 21. 4.) there ſhall be *no more death*. My concordances do not furniſh me with more places wherein the righteous are ſaid *not to die any more*.

The apoſtle *Paul*, treating of the reſurrection of the righteous, writes concerning the body, "it is ſown in corruption it is raiſed in *incorruption*. Now this I ſay, brethren, that fleſh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God: neither doth corruption inherit *incorruption*. The dead ſhall be raiſed *incorruptible*; and we ſhall be changed: for this corruptible muſt put on *incorruption*, and this mortal muſt put on *immortality*; ſo, when this corruptible ſhall have put on *incorruption*, and this mortal ſhall have put on *immortality*, then ſhall be brought to paſs that ſaying, Death is ſwallowed up in victory." (1 Cor. 15. 42, 50, 52, 53, 54.) theſe aſſertions relate to the body, and expreſs the change it ſhall undergo, in order to that *glorious immortality* intended by *eternal life*, and which paſſes upon the

righteous, ere they, in their complete perſons, enter the heavenly regions. The *Greek* tranſlated *immortality* is applied to the righteous only *twice*. What is rendered here *incorruption* is tranſlated *immortality* in 2 Tim. 1. 10 and Rom, 2. 7. This laſt place is a full proof that *incorruption* means *leſs* than *eternal life*; for in it the apoſtle tells us, that, to them, who by patient continuance in well doing ſeek for glory and honour and *incorruption*, God will render *eternal life*.

And thus the reader may obſerve, that the righteous are not *once* ſaid to be *indiſſoluble*; that make the moſt of it, they are ſaid, only *thrice, not to die any more*; but *twice* to be *immortal*, and *five* times to be *incorruptible*; however that *incorruption* is by the apoſtle *Paul* affirmed to be *inferior* to *eternal life*. They who, after weighing what hath been now mentioned, and the number of times the adjective *aionios*—eternal, is joined to life in the New Teſtament, will pretend, that we could not know, that the righteous would be *happy for ever*, but becauſe they are ſaid in other ſcriptures to be *incorruptible (indiſſoluble) immortal, not to die any more*, and the like, are ſo enthuſiaſtically fond of their own dogma, as to be out of the reach of reaſon with regard to the point in hand.

It remains that we examine the different meanings of the noun *aion* in the Acts, Epiſtles and Revelation. But let it be firſt noted, that *aion* hath ſeveral ſignifications, like a number of *Engliſh* words, with which if a perſon is not well acquainted, he will blunder moſt egregiouſly in tranſlating them into another language: juſt as a novice who ſhould tranſlate the original in Luke 16. 8. "the children of *this eternity*," becauſe that *aion* in other places intends *eternity*; The ſchool-boy who, having been converſant with the *Greek* for a while, would obſtinately refuſe to

tranſlate

tranſlate it *world* though confined to ſuch like ſignification by the pronoun *this*; or maintain that the ſenſe muſt be the ſame, the ſound being the ſame, in all places, might probably be adjudged to wholeſome diſcipline. Ignorance in, or inattention to, the different meanings of the ſame word in the *Hebrew*, has given riſe to a moſt ridiculous circumſtance in the pictures of *Moſes*, who is generally drawn with *horns*. We are told (Ex. 34. 29.) that when he deſcended from mount *Sinai* the ſkin of his face *ſhone*, the original means alſo a horn. In the vulgate edition of the old teſtament, in uſe among the Roman Catholics and authorized by their Popes, it is tranſlated, his face was *horned*, and hence that ridiculous circumſtance.

Aion, with other *Greek* words to confine its meaning, in nine places anſwers to *this world*; in three to *the preſent world*; in one to *the preſent evil world*; in one to *the world to come*; in one to *ſince the world began*; and in one to *according to* (the *age* or manners of the age, or as in our tranſlation) *the courſe of this world*: in the laſt quotation *aion* is rendered the *courſe*, and another word is uſed for the *world*.

We cannot ſuppoſe, that the apoſtle *James*, in that grand conſultation which was held at *Jeruſalem* by the apoſtles, elders and whole chriſtian church within that city, reſpecting the liberties of the *Gentile* converts, meant any thing ſhort of "known from *eternity* unto God are all his works;" it is pity therefore that the original *aion* had not been ſo tranſlated, inſtead of "known unto God are all his works from *the beginning of the world*."*

Paul wrote to the *Corinthians*, "if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no fleſh for *ever*," this is more in the ſtyle of the apoſtle and ſuits the *Engliſh* idiom as well as *while the world ſtandeth*.† When he ſaith

* Acts 15. 18. † 1 Cor. 8. 13.

ſaith of the liberal man, "his righteouſneſs remaineth for *ever*,"‡ he may mean that the power and inclination of that his righteouſneſs which conſiſteth in diſperſing abroad and giving to the poor, remaineth for *ever*, in the preceding ſenſe, *while life laſteth*. In his epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, he ſpeaks of Chriſt's being a prieſt for *ever*, and conſecrated for *evermore*, five times; which in the opinion of numbers means only a certain unchangeable duration unto the end of the time and works of the goſpel; but they who ſuppoſe, that the prieſthood of Chriſt, after having put the ſaints into poſſeſſion of glory, will have a continued influence in the glorified ſtate, will plead that a *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity is intended: without doubt the apoſtle deſigned *that* when he applied to Chriſt a quotation (from Pſ. 45. 6, 7.) in the words of the ſeptuagint ſaying, "thy throne, O God, is for *ever and ever*," &c. and when he ſaid that Chriſt continueth *ever*.

Peter alſo meant a *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity when he declared "the word of God abideth for *ever*;" and again "the word of the Lord endureth for *ever*," which is no other than a quotation of Iſaiah's aſſertion, "but the word of our God ſhall ſtand for *ever*." He certainly meant it, when he cloſed his ſecond epiſtle with "to him, i.e. our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, be glory, both now and for the *day* (or term) *of eternity*," an unuſual expreſſion in the original, and which is tranſlated "both now and for *ever*." Surely it is reaſonable then to underſtand him as meaning *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity, when he writes of the ungodly "to whom the miſt of darkneſs is reſerved for *ever*." The very ſame expreſſion, in the original, that *Jude* makes uſe of concerning them, though rendered ſomewhat different, "to whom is reſerved the blackneſs of darkneſs for *ever*."

When John writes, of the truth "and which ſhall be with us for *ever*;" it is not ſo clear that he intends

a

‡ 2 Cor. 9. 9.

a *proper* eternity, as when he aſſerts, "he that doth the will of God abideth for *ever*."

Theſe are all the places in the Acts, Epiſtles and Revelation, in which *aion* occurs in the ſingular number, excepting Eph. 3. 21. where it precedes the plural and helps to form one of the ſtrongeſt expreſſions, which the devout zeal of the apoſtle *Paul* could deviſe for glorifying God—"unto him be glory in the church by Chriſt Jeſus, *throughout all ages world without end*," as in the *Engliſh*. *Blackwall* in his ſacred claſſics,* ſays of this concluſion, "it defies any verſion to come any thing near it, and commands our wonder." Dr. *Doddridge* pronounces it, "one of St. *Paul*'s ſelf-invented and moſt expreſſive phraſes;" and adds, "*through all the ſucceſſions of an endleſs eternity*, may come ſomething near it; but even this *emphatical* as it may ſeem, falls vaſtly ſhort of the ſublimity and ſpirit of the *Original*."

The apoſtle uſes the plural of *aion* five times in pronouncing the Creator, God, bleſſed for *ever*, and for *evermore*; and in aſcribing glory to him for *ever*: and once in declaring, Jeſus Chriſt the ſame yeſterday, to day, and for *ever*. Toward the latter end of his epiſtle to the *Hebrews* he writes, "through faith we underſtand that the *worlds* were framed by the word of God:" and in the beginning, that by his Son He made the *worlds*, which ſome would render, He conſtituted the *ages*, meaning the diſpenſations of the church and world. When he ſays to the *Corinthians*, "upon whom the ends of the *world* (ages) are come," he means upon whom the concluding age or laſt diſpenſation of God to mankind on earth is come. In agreement herewith Dr. *Doddridge* hath, "but now once for all at the concluſion of the *ages*," inſtead of "but now once in the end of the *world*, hath he appeared to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf."† There

are

* Vol. I. p. 64. 12mo. † Heb. 9. 26.

are interpreters of note, who would render " according to the *eternal* purpoſe which he purpoſed in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord,"* according to that prediſpoſition of the ages, or ſeveral diſpenſations which he made in Chriſt Jeſus: while others prefer the common tranſlation as agreeing moſt with the meaning of the original. When he mentions of the *Epheſians* that they were quickened together with Chriſt and ſo on, that God " might in the *ages* to come ſhew the exceeding riches of his grace" he means finite periods: and the like, when he writes to the *Coloſſians* of the myſtery which had been hid from *ages* and generations. But when he mentions, " the hidden wiſdom which God ordained before *the world* unto our glory;"† and " the myſtery which from *the beginning of the world* hath been hid in God,"‡ he means more than our tranſlation hath expreſſed, even from *eternity*, or *eternal ages*; the ſame as when he ſtyles God the King of *ages*, which in our tranſlation is *eternal*.‖

It is frequent for writers, in certain caſes to ſtrengthen their expreſſions, by what might otherwiſe be ſtyled redundancies: the practice is not only allowable, but oratorial. *For ever* intends to all eternity, and ſo doth *for ever and ever*; and *for ever and ever, world without end*, can intend no more: but there is more force in the *manner* of one than the other. The ſacred writers uſe different forms to expreſs the ſame meaning; and it is done alſo by one and the ſame writer. *Paul* cloſeth his doxologies with two plurals of *aion* in five places, in each they are rendered for *ever and ever*. *Peter* doth it twice. The noun *aion* is uſed in no other way whatever in the Revelation of *John*, where the plurals occur fourteen times. Our Lord uſeth them when he ſaith, " I am he that liveth and was dead and behold I am alive for *evermore*:" and they

* Eph. 3. 11. † 1 Cor. 2. 7. ‡ Eph. 3. 9. ‖ 1 Tim. 1. 17.

they are uſed, when it is ſaid, that he ſhall reign for *ever and ever*; and of the ſervants of the Lamb in the *New Jeruſalem*, that they ſhall reign for *ever and ever*: and five times when it is aſſerted of God, that he liveth for *ever and ever*. They cloſe doxologies three times. In *each* of theſe eleven inſtances *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity is intended: and yet truly *all* muſt be no evidence that *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity is intended in the remaining three, when it is ſaid, "and the ſmoke of their torment aſcendeth up for *ever and ever*;* and her ſmoke roſe up for *ever and ever*;† and the devil that deceived them was caſt into the lake of fire and brimſtone, where the beaſt and the falſe prophet are, and ſhall be tormented day and night for *ever and ever*.‡ The moſt mighty reaſons ought to be produced for ſuch liberties with the phraſeology of a ſacred writer, which would not be otherwiſe allowed in the caſe of a human author. Should it be urged, that the great whore, whoſe ſmoke is ſaid to riſe up for *ever and ever*, is the ſame with ſpiritual *Babylon*, that great city which makes all nations drink of the wine of its raging fornication, and that the ſmoke of no city can go up for *ever and ever*, underſtanding *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity, becauſe after a while it will be totally conſumed: it is anſwered, as hath been obſerved with regard to *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, that it is not the buildings ſo much as the citizens that are intended; and beſides, that the great whore, *Babylon* and the beaſt are but different names for one and the ſame community; and it is aſſerted of the beaſt and the falſe prophet that they are in the lake of fire and brimſtone, (when the cloſing ſcene hath taken place) where they ſhall be tormented day and night for *ever and ever*—ſo that, though the total deſtruction of the great city may be included, the *perpetual* puniſhment of the profligate

* Rev. 14. 11. —† 19. 3. —‡ 20. 10.

fligate and wicked citizens is the main thing intended, when it is ſaid, "and her ſmoke roſe up for *ever and ever.*" The place of torment to which they are conſigned, is figuratively ſpoken of, as a *lake of fire and brimſtone*, in alluſion probably to the kind of puniſhment by which divine juſtice was glorified in the deſtruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* and the neighbouring cities. The whole place might for ſome conſiderable time be a burning lake, and when the combuſtibles were greatly exhauſted might be extinguiſhed and filled with the waters of *Jordan* and other rivers, and form that lake, which afterwards took the name of the *Dead Sea*, or *Lake of Sodom.* The *blackneſs of darkneſs*, by which *Peter* and *Jude* repreſent future torments, may alſo be an alluſion to that horrid darkneſs, with which the whole atmoſphere for a vaſt number of miles was probably filled, by the ſulphurous ſoot and ſmoke that aſcended into it, and might hang over the curſed region, for weeks or longer before it was diſperſed, to awe and reform the inhabitants of diſtant cities.

It hath been falſely pleaded, that the Greek word *aidios* is more expreſſive of *proper* eternity than *aionios.* The Seventy never once uſe it, even where they could not but be perſuaded that the *Hebrew* meant *proper* eternity; and in the New Teſtament it is to be met with only *twice*, in Romans (1. 20.) where God's *eternal* power is mentioned, and in *Jude* (6 v.) when the fallen angels are ſaid to be reſerved in *everlaſting* chains.

After all that hath been obſerved upon *gnolam*, *aion* and *aionios*, ought we not to apprehend, that the *Angel* meant *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity, not only when he ſpoke to *Daniel*, of them that ſhould awake to *everlaſting* life, but alſo of them that ſhould awake to ſhame and *everlaſting* contempt*—that *John* the baptiſt meant the like, when he ſays of wicked profeſſors, comparing them to chaff

* Dan. 12. 2.

chaff for their worthleſſneſs, that Chriſt will burn them with *unquenchable* fire,*—our Lord alſo when he ſpeaks of ſinners being caſt into hell, *where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched*;† of their departing into *everlaſting* fire prepared for the devil and his angels, and their going into *everlaſting* puniſhment, while the righteous go into life *eternal*;‡ and of the blaſphemer againſt the holy Ghoſt being in danger of, or liable to *eternal* damnation"||——the apoſtle *Paul* when declaring, that the diſobedient ſhall be puniſhed at the appearance of Chriſt with *everlaſting* deſtruction from the preſence of the Lord §——the apoſtles *Peter* and *Jude* when they aſſert, that for the ungodly the blackneſs of darkneſs is reſerved for *ever*; that the angels which kept not their firſt eſtate are reſerved in *everlaſting* chains; and that the inhabitants of *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* ſuffer the vengeance of *eternal* fire ¶—and the apoſtle *John*, when he ſays, " the ſmoke of their torment aſcendeth up for *ever and ever*; her ſmoke roſe up for *ever and ever*; the devil, the beaſt and the falſe prophet ſhall be tormented for *ever and ever*."**

But notwithſtanding the above reaſoning upon the *original* words; and even though mathematical demonſtration could be given, that their *literal* import implied what we mean by *ſtrict* and *proper* eternity; yet, as they are often uſed *figuratively*, they, who are ſet upon denying the real eternity of hell torments, would maintain, that when applied to future puniſhments they are to be underſtood *figuratively*; and would require other arguments to ſupport the doctrine they reject.

Let us ſee then what was the opinion of *Jews* and *Gentiles* reſpecting this matter, in the times of our

* Mat. 3. 12. † Mark 9. 43—48. ‡ Mat. 25. 41, 46.
|| Mark 3. 29. § 2 Theſſ. 1. 9. ¶ 2 Peter 2. 17. Jude 6, 7, 13. ** Rev. 14. 11.—19. 3.—20. 10.

Saviour and his apoſtles. *Philo* of *Alexandria*, the hiſtorian and eminent for his learning, ſirnamed *Judæus* from his being a *Jew*, and who flouriſhed about forty years after our Lord's birth, when *Matthew* is ſuppoſed to have penned his goſpel, ſaith, "the puniſhment of the wicked perſon is *to live for ever dying*,* and *to be for ever* in pains and griefs and calamities that *never* ceaſe."† The original *Greek* tranſlated *to be for ever* is peculiarly ſtrong; we have no *Engliſh* word to anſwer it, was one coined upon the occaſion to *eternatize* might be adopted. Dr. *Scott* writes "had the ſcripture ſaid, in our *modern* ſtyle, that the *reprobate* ſhall be *ever dying*, and yet *never die*, there might have been ſome colour of argument, and it might have been *inferred*, that, though a *never-ceaſing-miſery* is not expreſſed in *ſo many* words, it is ſtill, from the *ſcripture-phraſeology*, *neceſſarily* implied." ‡ It will be noted by the reader, that *Philo*'s expreſſions are almoſt the very ſame with *ſhall be ever dying, and yet never die*, and therefore the latter is not a *modern* but *ancient* ſtyle, nearly as old if not older than any part of the New Teſtament; and though no part of it, yet is to be regarded as declaring the ſentiment of many of the firſt men among the *Jews*. And that this was the ſentiment of that ſect which was had in the greateſt repute by them, viz. the *Phariſees*, is confirmed by *Joſephus* who ſurvived the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, and informs us, "the *Phariſees* held, that the ſouls of the wicked were to be puniſhed with *perpetual* puniſhments, and that there was appointed for them a *perpetual* priſon." ‖ The word *aidios*, which he uſes, muſt

* Mangey's edition of his works, vol. 2. p. 419.

† Ditto p. 420. London 1742. ‡ Vol. 2. 341, 342.

‖ Bell Jud. l. 2. c. 8. § 14. p. 1065. Ant. l. 18. § 2. p. 793. Hudſon's edition Ox. 1720.

muſt mean *perpetual* as expreſſive of *proper* eternity; or he gives an uncertain unintelligible ſound, inſtead of informing us what the *Phariſees* held. That this opinion of theirs was not peculiar to them or the *Jews*, is plain from what *Ovid*, who died ſixteen years before our Lord's crucifixion, ſaith in his *Ibis* (lines 196, 197.)

Nec mortis pœnas mors altera finiet hujus:
Horaque erit tantis ultima nulla malis.

Herein he declares that *no future death ſhall put an end* to the pains and penalties of that death, to which the wicked ſhall be doomed; and that there will be *no laſt hour* to ſuch great evils. He was too debauched a libertine to believe it for his own part, but he gives us the common notion of the day: as doth *Seneca*, who was murdered by *Nero* anno domini 65, when in his *Hercules Furens* he makes *Amphytrio* aſk *Theſeus* adviſing him to refrain from human blood, &c.

Certus incluſos tenet
Locus nocentes? utque fert fama, impios
Supplicia vinculis ſæva perpetuis domant?

What! doth ſome certain place confine the guilty? and, as common report ſaith, do dreadful puniſhments keep the wicked under in *perpetual* (or *everlaſting*) chains?

Collins in his *Diſcourſe of free-thinking* (p. 36) aſſerts "the evil of ſuperſtition is now much increaſed, and men are under greater terrors and uneaſineſs of mind, than Pagans of old poſſibly could be, when they thought they hazarded leſs." Dr. *Bentley*, in his 21ſt Remark* upon *Collins*, anſwers, "this manifeſtly ſhews, that he thinks *eternal torments* were never imagined in the *Pagan* ſcheme, but were firſt introduced by Chriſtianity. Juſt contrary. The vulgar in Paganiſm univerſally believed

* My acknowledgments are here made to the Doctor's name-ſake at Cambridge, for having directed me to this Remark in the College Library.

believed them, as his friend *Lucretius*† would have told him in expreſs terms.

Nam, ſi certam finem eſſe viderent
Ærumnarum homines, aliqua ratione valerent
Relligionibus atque minis obſiſtere vatum:
Nunc ratio nūlla eſt reſtandi, nulla facultas;
Æternas quoniam POENAS in morte timendum.
1 B. l. 108.

[For, if men could ſee there would be a certain end of their miſeries, they would by ſome means or other get rid of the religions and threatnings of prieſts. At preſent there is no way, no power of ſtanding out againſt them; becauſe, truly, *eternal puniſhments* at death are to be dreaded.]

'Tis ſo falſe what our author lays down, that the Pagan religion gave leſs uneaſineſs in life becauſe they thought they *hazarded leſs* after death than we chriſtians think we do, that its certain they thought bad men *hazarded* as *much* and good men *obtained* infinitely *leſs*."

A queſtion ariſes, Did our Saviour or his Apoſtles contradict this common notion? Nothing of that kind appears from the New Teſtament; and the Papiſts pretend not to have any thing of it among the arcana of oral traditions; for as hath been already noted, tho' they hold a *purgatory*, they admit that abandoned wicked graceleſs ſpirits will be *perpetually* tormented. Had our Saviour thought, that the age was not ripe for the diſcovery of the *non-eternity* of hell torments; and that it was *prudent* to let the vulgar opinion prevail, till the remarkable out-pouring of the Spirit and the clearer inſtructions following upon it, had prepared the way for that *particular diſcovery*; his character as the great Prophet of the church might have been

† *Lucretius* died, aged forty four, and fifty four years before the birth of our Lord.

been capable of a full vindication, had he been *ſilent* upon the matter: but what will be thought, ſuppoſing the opinion to have been abſolutely falſe, ſhould he be found to have ſpoken ſo as to *confirm* the vulgar in their falſe opinion, and to have left his Apoſtles to do the ſame?

Our Lord was far from ſparing the *Phariſees* through fear of their reſentment: no deſign of conciliating their regards could induce him to countenance their errors: when alone with his diſciples we muſt conclude that he would be the furtheſt from doing it; and yet we find by *Mark*, that in ſuch a circumſtance, he appears to labour at impreſſing the minds of his followers with the idea, that future puniſhments were *really perpetual*, "it is better for thee to enter into life maimed than to go into hell, into the fire that *never ſhall be quenched*; where their worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched*:" and again, "than to be caſt into hell, into the fire that *never ſhall be quenched*; where their worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched*:" and the third time, "than to be caſt into hell-fire; where their worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched*." *Matthew*, in his abridged account of this matter, mentions only hell-fire and *everlaſting* fire. * That the diſciples might not ſlight the *pains of hell* they are compared to a *worm* and to *fire* on account of the exquiſite *torment*, that the gnawings of the one and the burnings of the other produce upon living bodies; and not on account of the *deſtruction* that either occaſion to *dead* carcaſes that feel no pain. That they might not imagine, theſe pains would end after a while, for as much as a material worm dieth and proper fire goeth out, our Lord ſaith, their worm *dieth not* and the fire is *not quenched*, and he repeats is again and again—the aſcription of ſuch *perpetual* qualities, to the worm and to

* Matt. 18. 8, 9.

to the fire, manifeſted alſo, that the worm and the fire were to be taken *figuratively*; which muſt moreover appear with reference to the *worm* from hence, that a *real* worm can live but a moment in the *fire*; and if the *fire* muſt be underſtood metaphorically, there is equal or ſuperior reaſon for ſuppoſing the ſame of the *worm*. How little ground then had Dr. *Scott* to ſay, "as to that conſtruction, which ſome *modern writers* have put upon this *worm*, as though it ſhould relate to the *remorſe* of *conſcience*, it requires no other reply than this, that it is a mere *arbitrary* interpretation, that has no proof or warrant from the ſcripture uſe of this phraſe."* Would leiſure and opportunity admit, probably it might be ſhewn, that the conſtruction of ſome modern writers is the ſame with that of ſome ancient ones; and that the Dr. has failed here, as much as before, in his *modern ſtyle*. But to pronounce, "it requires no other reply than this, that it is a *mere arbitrary* interpretation," is tantamount to telling us, that we muſt underſtand it *literally*, which obliges us to embrace an *abſurdity*; how much eaſier to conceive it alludes to the *gnawings of conſcience*! and how ſtriking the alluſion! However, a careful judicious reader of Dr. *Scott*'s ſermons will apprehend, that the Dr's head was ſtrangely poſſeſſed with the notion that hell-fire was real and material; and that much of his reaſoning againſt the wicked's being eternally puniſhed is built upon that notion—a notion evidently ſubverted by our Lords ſaying, that in the day of judgment the accurſed ſhall depart into *everlaſting fire prepared for the devil and his angels*. How *material* fire by any preparation can torment the devil and his angels muſt exceed the comprehenſion of every mortal; if the accurſed then are to be puniſhed in the ſame fire with them, we ought to underſtand the term *fire* in a *figurative* ſenſe, for

* Vol. 2. p. 352.

for that misery which the wrath of an offended God kindleth. But should we grant, that the *bodies* of the wicked will be consumed and burnt up by the fire of hell, be it what it may, a difficulty still remaineth, viz. can the spirits of such bodies be also consumed or burnt up by such fire in length of time, without any annihilating act of the divine Being? If they are mere spirits, then it appeareth to me impossible: and as to their being struck out of existence by an annihilating act of God the scripture appears to be totally silent upon the head. It may be urged in support of their being *totally* destroyed, that *John* the baptist compares them to *chaff*, which fire will, of course, burn up *altogether*. But it must be noted, that he uses the comparison in accommodation to the other parts of the simile he hath a recourse to, while speaking of Christ, "whose fan, he says, is in his hand, and who will thoroughly purge his floor." Dr. *Doddridge* in his note upon the place, saith, "as to the phrase of burning the chaff with *unquenchable fire*, Mr. *Horberry* has observed with his usual accuracy of judgment (*Enquiry into the Duration of future Punishment*,* Ch. 1. No. 1, 2.) that it is absolutely inconsistent with all views of the *Restoration of the wicked*; and that however the phrase of being *consumed like chaff* might seem to favour the doctrine of their *annihilation* (which, nevertheless, it is certain no punishment of mind or body can of itself effect) the epithet of *unquenchable* given to this *fire* is so far from proving it, that it cannot by any easy and just interpretation be reconciled with it."

Our Lord compares "the kingdom of heaven to a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which when it was full, the fishermen drew to shore

* I have enquired after, but have not been able to get a sight of this author, and should be greatly obliged to any gentleman for the loan of it,

ſhore and ſat down, and gathered the good into veſſels, but caſt the bad away. So ſhall it be, ſaith our Lord, at the end of the world; the angels ſhall come forth, and ſever the wicked from among the juſt, and ſhall caſt them into the furnace of fire, there ſhall be wailing and gnaſhing of teeth."* The Dr. gives us this note upon it, "the word which we render *bad*, generally ſignifies *corrupt* or *putrid*, and ſeems an alluſion to the drawing up ſome *dead fiſh* in a net with the living. Mr. *Horberry* juſtly obſerves, that this in the ſtrongeſt terms repreſents the hopeleſs ſtate of ſinners at laſt."

Our Lord did further confirm the opinion of the *Phariſees* reſpecting the perpetuity of future torments, when, a few days before his crucifixion, he cloſes his repreſentation of the laſt judgment with ſaying, and theſe (the accurſed) ſhall go away into *everlaſting puniſhment*, but the righteous into *life eternal?* It was impoſſible, after what he had taught them before, and conſidering the known doctrine of the *Phariſees*, that his diſciples could, without a *particular caution* to direct them, apprehend, that the puniſhment of the wicked might, or was to be of ſhorter duration than the life of the righteous, the adjective applied to both being one and the ſame in the original; and that *eternal life* was meant to expreſs a *glorious immortality*, and neceſſarily implied *proper* eternity hath been already proved.

Thus it appears, that our Lord inſtead of contradicting, or even being ſilent as to the common notion of the *proper* eternity of future puniſhment, contributed by his very expreſſions; and the circumſtances attending them, to eſtabliſh it. We may obſerve alſo, that the apoſtles after the miraculous effuſion of the holy Spirit, and their being *fully* inſtructed in the things of religion,

* Mark 13. 47, 48, 49.

religion, no where teach contrary to what the *Phariſees* held. Should it be pleaded, that *Paul* makes uſe of the word *deſtruction*, which ſeems to imply the being put out of exiſtence; it is anſwered, that *everlaſting deſtruction* evidently means the ſame with *everlaſting puniſhment*, which is ſtiled *deſtruction*, not in reference to the wicked's being ſtruck out of exiſtence, but to the deſtruction of all his comforts, when, as the apoſtle teaches elſewhere, God ſhall render to him, by Chriſt the Judge, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguiſh. Conſidering the number of Gentile converts, and that the goſpel diſpenſation was deſigned for all people, had the apoſtles thought, that future puniſhments were not properly eternal, and that the doctrine of eternal puniſhments would be a grand obſtacle to the propagating of chriſtianity, and that the contrary was a truth which it was profitable upon the whole to proclaim moſt audibly, that every body might hear it, and not have *terrors propoſed to them that exceed belief* —we muſt conclude that they would have declared themſelves freely and explicitly upon the head; whereas they evidently join with their Lord in countenancing and eſtabliſhing the common opinion of the day, that future puniſhments were *really* everlaſting. Indeed if they are not ſtrictly ſo, the uſe of the word *everlaſting* or *eternal*, always one and the ſame in the original (excepting the two places above mentioned where *aidios* occurs) is, not to ſay worſe, little leſs than trifling; the ſame may be obſerved of the terms, *that dieth not* and *that is not quenched*. When it is ſaid, that the worm *dieth not*, that the fire is *not quenched*, that it is *everlaſting*, that the puniſhment is *everlaſting*, and that the chains are *everlaſting*——the aſcription of theſe *perpetual* qualities is deſigned to excite *ſpecial* terror; but what *ſpecial* terror is juſtly excited by

their being *perpetual*, if the party puniſhed is wholly deſtroyed or after a while eſcapes by a change of place. *Perpetuity* is nothing to the purpoſe, is of no avail at all, when a total deſtruction is effected, or the ſufferer has got out of hell for *ever*.

The anſwer quoted (p. 22, 23.) to ſet aſide the argument drawn from its being ſaid "their worm *dieth not*, and the fire is *not quenched*," is, in expreſſions different, but in meaning the ſame with what *Mr. Richardſon* gave above a hundred years ago, viz. "fire may be ſaid to be *everlaſting*, when it doth not go out, till the combuſtible matter is conſumed." To which it was replied, that, "at this rate of arguing, his own beard might be called an *everlaſting* beard, as it was capable of growing while the nourithing matter laſted; and that the flame of a farthing candle might be called an *everlaſting* fire, ſince it would laſt till the wick was ſpent."

The reader is deſired likewiſe to recollect the ſcripture repreſentation of the cloſing ſcene, with which all human affairs finiſh. When the ſecond advent of our Lord commenceth, then is the hour in which all that are in their graves ſhall hear his voice, and ſhall come forth, they that have done good unto the reſurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the reſurrection of damnation, The quick and the dead are judged by him; and he renders to every man according to his deeds. The period employed in this moſt ſolemn and intereſting tranſaction—grand beyond deſcription—affecting beyond conception—is ſtiled the *day of judgment*: but of how long continuance is matter of uncertain conjecture, being reſerved among the arcana of heaven. On its ending, the accurſed go away into everlaſting puniſhment; and the righteous into eternal life; anſwerable to the irreverſible

ſentence

ſentence of the upright Judge. And thus all human affairs terminate, and are fixed—the ſcene cloſes—— and all expectation of a *new ſtate* of probation, and of a *new* ſentence is ſet aſide.

The pamphlet (p. 24.) ſpeaks of hell as the *next ſtate*, wherein, though "the ſufferings of the wicked will be *exceedingly great* in *degree*, as well as *long* in *duration*," they are really under a *merciful* and *gracious* diſpenſation, as it is, "in order that they may be the *willing people of God.*" How far *condemning* the wicked to *ſuffer* the puniſhments of hell, is placing them *anew* under a *merciful* and *gracious* diſpenſation, let every one judge for himſelf! But when it is added "nor will they be delivered from their *ſuffering* till this is effected, i. e. till they are made the *willing people of God*" all expectation of their being delivered is at an end; and the *main* objections againſt the *proper* eternity of hell torments are virtually abandoned. If the wicked may be puniſhed in hell, till they become holy and are fit for heaven; then in caſe they become not holy, God can conſiſtently with his juſtice goodneſs and other attributes, puniſh them *everlaſtingly*. Should they be thus *everlaſtingly* puniſhed, it is for ſins committed in this world, or becauſe of their *continuing to ſin*: if for the former, then they may be *everlaſtingly* puniſhed for *temporary* crimes: if for the latter, they are continued *perpetually* in a ſtate of ſuffering, without the divine Being's *preventing* it, through *benevolence*, by ſtriking them out of exiſtence.

Let it be now noted, that it is morally impoſſible, that their ſufferings in hell ſhould make them the *willing people of God*. In the worſt of company, with the devil and his angels, ſurrounded by accurſed perſons like themſelves, and *not a ſingle* holy ſoul in the place, how can it be thought, that they will learn to be holy?

They

They go to the place of torments with fixed habits of wickedneſs. Is it the nature of thoſe puniſhments, which occaſion wailing and gnaſhing of teeth, to produce holy diſpoſitions, full acquieſcence in the government of heaven, and love to God? Do ſuch puniſhments in general take this effect upon earth, that we may look for the like in hell; or is it not the very reverſe? From what we know by preſent experience, may we not fear that the torments of hell will excite rage and rancour of heart, and lead on to the moſt horrid blaſphemies? The gentlemen, who hold the Salvation of all men, it is judged, exclude all *poſitive* operation of the Almighty in effecting holy diſpoſitions, under the notion of its being inconſiſtent with moral agency: we muſt not therefore admit of any ſuch operation in hell; the damned then are left to the full influence of their wicked habits, in a ſtate that hath a natural tendency to ſtrengthen them; ſo that we muſt deſpair of their ever being made, by ſuffering, *the willing people of God*; or rather, of their being induced, by their ſuffering, to *make themſelves* ſo. However could we believe, that it might happen with reſpect to many or the majority; yet ſhould a *ſingle* ſoul remain poſſeſſed of wicked principles, and continue everlaſtingly in the place of torments, the ſcheme of *Univerſal Salvation* is fallacious. Yea, ſhould *any one* of the fallen angels continue everlaſtingly there, then the chief arguments, againſt the proper eternity of hell torments, would be thereby proved to be futile. It might be aſked, if the pains of hell are calculated to produce holineſs, how comes it to paſs, that we have *no intimation*, that ſome of the fallen angels, who know alſo what the loſs of heaven meaneth, have at length by their ſufferings learnt obedience, recovered their virtue and been reſtored to happineſs? What may be

the

the opinion of the favourers of *Univerſal Salvation* with regard to the wicked at death, whether they fall aſleep, not to awake till the day of judgment, or are conveyed to a place of puniſhment, may not have been *publiſhed as yet*: but ſhould the wicked go to hell upon dying, agreeable to the repreſentation made in the parable of the rich libertine, we may conclude, that there is no hope of their being made *the willing people of God* by their ſufferings. They that will have died five thouſand years before the day of judgment, will be then condemned to the puniſhment of hell for the wicked deeds done in the body: but if they had, within that period of ſuffering, learnt to fear and love God, are we to ſuppoſe, they would be ſent again to hell, being already fit for heaven? It is more reaſonable to think, that they continue in their diſembodied ſtate, during the intermediate ſpace between death and judgment, impenitent, without undergoing a change of moral character. Who will may believe, that it will be afterwards effected, by their ſuffering in bodies to which they have been united by the reſurrection.

No other anſwer need be given to Dr. *Hartley*'s aſſertion, that "it does not appear from the writings of the moſt ancient fathers, that they conſtrued the texts that ſpeak of the future puniſhment in the *never-ending* ſenſe;" than that Dr. *Watts* writes, "It is really an impoſition upon unlearned readers to pretend, that the doctrine which denies the eternity of the puniſhments of hell, was the common ſenſe of the primitive fathers, though it is granted that *Origen* and ſome others *might* be of this opinion."*

It

* *Watts*'s World to come, Vol. 2. p. 320. Dr. *Watts* might word himſelf thus guardedly "*might be* of this opinion" by reaſon of what ſome writers on the Controverſy have noted, "*that Origen* ſignalized himſelf by explaining the ſcripture, and

It has been already ſhewn, that *Origen* and *Clement* were notorious for *introducing* into the church the *pagan philoſophy* and *vain deceit*, that Dr. *Hartley* complains of, as what might prove introductory to the belief of the *abſolute eternity* of puniſhment: from whence it would rather follow, upon the Dr's reaſoning, that the *denial* of ſuch *abſolute eternity*, if truly imputed to *Origen* and *Clement*, was owing to the *pagan philoſophy* and *vain deceit* he alludes to. It would have been much more to the purpoſe could the Dr. have ſaid, that the *denial* of this *never-ending* ſenſe of future puniſhment in the ancient creeds, ſhews that it *was* no *original doctrine*; but the mere *omiſſion* of this *never-ending* ſenſe in ſuch creeds, rather ſhews that it *was* an *original doctrine*, inſtead of the contrary, and that it was generally admitted, and therefore the *inſertion* of it was *needleſs*.

The

and confuting of hereſies; *that* whatever enemies he had while living, their hatred of him was not grounded on heterodox, or ſingular, opinions laid to his charge, but took its riſe from envy at his growing reputation and uſefulneſs; *that* the common charge againſt him was not heard of till a long time after his death, when his writings might be conſiderably interpolated and corrupted (as other ancient writings were) *that* his books of *Principles* are extant only in a *Latin* tranſlation not to be depended upon, and thoſe publiſhed by *Huet*, are commonly ſuppoſed to be in ſeveral places corrupted; *that* his eight books againſt *Celſus*, which he wrote in his old age, and are come down to us rather more pure than any other of his works, contain nothing *clearly favourable* to the opinion aſcribed to him, but much that is inconſiſtent therewith." It has been much queſtioned whether *Origen* and *Clement* of *Alexandria* did really and ſteadily believe, that devils and damned men would be at length reſtored to the favour of God. "*Clement* is charged with this by *Le Clerc*, and ſome few others. But tho' he refers to *Plato*, as obſerving, that God inflicts no puniſhment but for the good of his creatures, 'tis not deducible from any thing he ſays, that he approved of this as true *univerſally*.

The contents of the pamphlet entitled *Salvation for all Men*, &c. &c. have been, it is hoped, fully and fairly canvaſſed. May it not be thought, that the following reflections will occur to one or another upon the occaſion?

The arguments brought to prove the *proper* eternity of hell torments, ſhould they not ſilence every objection, are ſufficient to evince the *wiſdom* and *prudence* of not hazarding any thing on the poſſibility of the contrary doctrine.

No man of common ſenſe and underſtanding can be juſtified in allowing himſelf to live in vicious courſes, and other than the ſcriptures preſcribe, on the *peradventure* that *everlaſting* puniſhment is no more than a *figurative* expreſſion for an *indefinite time*; and on the preſumption of his learning to be holy in hell among devils and damned ſpirits, ſhould he omit doing it under all the ſuperior advantages attending the preſent ſtate of probation.

But ſhould it be doubted, whether future puniſhment is *properly eternal*; yet the *Salvation of all Men* is a *diſtinct* ſubject, and may be abſolutely falſe, though the damned ſhould not be always ſuffering. The evidence of ſcripture againſt the *Salvation of all Men* is ſo full and expreſs, that no dependance can be had upon any doctrine of revelation, if not on that which teaches, that ſome individuals will never be admitted to the enjoyment of everlaſting happineſs. Whatever becomes of them, they will not be ſuffered to enter the heavenly paradiſe; or the word of God, is, as the Papiſts tell us, a noſe of wax that may be formed into any ſhape, and requires an infallible interpreter; whom, though they pretend to poſſeſs, they are not agreed in; it being a queſtion agitated among them, whether it is the Pope in his own perſon, or a general council, or the church diffuſive, or the Pope and a general council in conjunction.

conjunction. It muſt be the height of folly therefore for a perſon to encourage himſelf in any evil practice on earth, from the preſent eaſe, pleaſure or profit it may afford him, under an apprehenſion, that, after having ſuffered for a longer or ſhorter period in hell, he ſhall remove to heaven, where his happineſs will be the better flavoured by reaſon of the miſeries through which he hath paſſed. Muſt not a conduct of this kind evidence a greater lunacy, than what ſubjects multitudes to confinement!

The pamphlet hath a natural tendency, by holding forth a diſtant *never ending* happineſs to every one, though wicked in the *higheſt poſſible* degree, to encourage the indulgence of paſſions, ſubverſive of family and civil government, and of the moſt deſtructive quality: and therefore is in itſelf pernicious beyond expreſſion, and more eſpecially ſo at the preſent particular time, wherein liberty hath too univerſally degenerated into licentiouſneſs. Whether it hath mended or injured the morals of individuals, and made them better or worſe huſbands, parents, children, neighbours, citizens or chriſtians, is not below the attention of thoſe that eſpouſe it.

What can we think of thoſe teachers, who, apprehending the doctrine of *Univerſal Salvation* to be ſcriptural (notwithſtanding the countenance our Lord and his Apoſtles gave to the contrary) undertake to publiſh it, as from the houſe-top, for a *wholeſome* doctrine, though they have not the *example* of their Lord and his apoſtles to warrant them?—that they are not arrived at years of *diſcretion*? or, that they have paſt them? If happily ſo grounded in the love of virtue as to need no terrors, they might have conſidered more the bulk of mankind, and in mercy to the preſent world *have had their faith to themſelves.*

2 JY 61